

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XV. APRIL 1879.

ART. I.—THE PETRINE CLAIMS AT THE BAR
OF HISTORY.

1. *Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster.* By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The See of S. Peter.* By T. W. ALLIES. (London, 1850.)
3. *The Evidence for the Papacy, as derived from the Holy Scriptures and from Primitive Antiquity.* By the Hon. COLIN LINDSAY. (London, 1870.)
4. *The Privilege of Peter and the Claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves.* By ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A. (London, 1875.)
5. *S.S. Conciliorum et Decretorum Collectio Nova. Omnia collegit* JOANNES DOMINICUS MANSI. (Lucca, 1748-52.)

THE third stage of the inquiry into the authenticity of the Petrine claim of privilege, already pursued through Holy Scripture and the chief early glosses thereupon—that concerned with its historical aspect, and, first, the canons and decrees of the Councils—must now be entered on. And it should be borne in mind that the number, the variety, and the distribution of these Councils over a vast period of time, make it certain that the ‘privilege of Peter,’ from its intimate bearing on disciplinary questions, must needs occupy a considerable and prominent place in them, if it be so much as

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV. B

370611

a fact of history, to say nothing of being a fundamental dogma of Christianity.

The Acts of the Councils, that is to say, the record of their proceedings from their convocation till their dispersion, also throw very much light upon the discussion ; but the consideration of that part of the evidence must be postponed for the present, and only the actual decrees and canons are as yet to be cited.

Now, let us inquire into the authority of the Councils as recognised in the Church of Rome. First comes the eleventh clause of the Creed of Pius IV. :—

‘ I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and especially by the Holy Council of Trent ; and I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto.’

Next, the profession of S. Gregory the Great, embodied in the Canon Law, *Decret.* i. dist. xv. 2 :—

‘ I acknowledge that I receive and venerate, as I do the Four Gospels, the Four Councils, to wit, the Nicene . . . also the Constantinopolitan . . . the first of Ephesus . . . that of Chalcedon moreover, . . . I embrace them with entire devotion, I guard them with perfect approval, because on them, as on a squared stone, the building of the Holy Faith rises.’

Thirdly, the solemn profession made by every Pope at his consecration, which in the *Liber Diurnus*, as cited by the Canon Law, *Decret.* i. dist. xvi. 8, is thus worded :—

‘ The eight Holy General Councils—that is, Nice first, Constantinople second, Ephesus third, Chalcedon fourth, Constantinople fifth and sixth, Nice seventh, and Constantinople eighth—I profess with mouth and heart to be kept unaltered in a single tittle [*usque ad unum apicem immutata servari*], to account them worthy of equal honour and veneration, to follow in every respect whatsoever they promulgated or decreed, and to condemn whatsoever they condemned.’

1. The very ancient body of rules known as the Canons of the Apostles knows not of any officer higher than bishops save the primate or ‘first bishop’ of each nation (*ἐπίσκοπος*), and is thus earlier than the institution of provincial archbishops or metropolitans. This ‘first bishop,’ albeit the chief single authority, whose consent is to be sought by the others, must himself do nothing against their consent. No further appeal is provided. The whole Canon (xxxiii.) merits citation, because of its remarkably explicit testimony to that primitive independence of national Churches which is the peculiar object of Ultramontane hostility :—

'It is fit that the Bishops of each nation should recognise their Primate (*τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον*), and treat him as Head, and do nothing of moment without his assent; for each Bishop should manage those concerns alone which pertain to his own diocese and its dependent regions. But neither let him [the Primate] do aught without the assent of all; for so shall there be concord, and God shall be glorified through the Lord in the Holy Spirit.'

2. The Councils of Ancyra, Neocæsarea, and Arles I., all earlier than Nicæa, are silent.

3. The Council of Laodicea recognises the authority of metropolitans (*Can. xii.*), but specifies nothing higher or more central in character.

4. The first General Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, contains an important piece of evidence. In settling the claims of the see of Alexandria, it decrees (*Can. vi.*):—

'Let the ancient custom prevail in Egypt, and Libya, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all these, since this is the accustomed practice for the Bishop in Rome also; and similarly in Antioch and the other eparchies [*i.e.* primatial sees of the first class] let the precedence be preserved to the Churches.'

There is a very ancient Latin version of this Canon, confirmed by Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl. xi. 6*), which explains that its meaning was that the Patriarch of Alexandria should have the same authority over all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis as the Pope of Rome had over the 'suburbicarian' Churches of his province; that is to say, those of Central and Southern Italy, with the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica; a limitation which shows that no universal jurisdiction was then attributed to the see of S. Peter, but only a province far exceeded in extent, population, wealth, and importance by several others at the time, except in so far as it contained the late capital of the Empire.

5. The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, in its ninth Canon, forbids appeals to be carried further (*περαιτέρω*) than the provincial synod assembled under the metropolitan.

6. The Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, allows an appeal to the Pope under certain specified circumstances. Its third Canon runs:—

'If in any province a bishop have a dispute with a brother bishop, let neither of them call in a bishop from another province as arbiter; but if any bishop be cast in any suit, and think his case good, so that the judgment ought to be reviewed, if it please you, let us honour the memory of S. Peter the Apostle, and let those who have tried the cause write to Julius, Bishop of Rome, that if needful he may pro-

vide for a rehearing of the cause by the bishops nearest to the province, and send arbiters; or if it cannot be established that the matter needs reversal, then what has been decided is not to be rescinded, but the existing state of things is to be confirmed.'

Canon iv. provides that a bishop, deposed by a local synod, and appealing to Rome, shall not have his see filled up till the Pope has confirmed the sentence.

Canon v. empowers the Pope either to commit the rehearing to the Bishops of the neighbouring province, or to send a legate of his own to rehear the cause.

On these decrees, which are the basis of the whole appellate jurisdiction of the Roman Church, the following remarks have to be made: (1.) These Canons of Sardica, passed by an exclusively Western assembly, were never received by the Eastern Church. (2.) The specification of the name of Pope Julius makes it at least doubtful whether this was not a personal privilege which died with him, as there is no provision for securing the same right to his successors. (3.) The privilege, such as it is, has stringent limits, and does not grant any initiative whatever to the Pope, who must await a direct application to himself; no applicant save a bishop is contemplated; nor even he, unless when condemned by a synod. (4.) The terms of the Canon, inclusive of the reference to S. Peter, are such as to show that the Fathers of the Council were making a voluntary concession, which they were quite at liberty to withhold, not complying with a duty divinely imposed upon them.

7. The Council of Gangra, held between 325 and 380, which enacted twenty-one disciplinary Canons, received by the whole Church, is silent.

8. The second General Council—that of Constantinople in 381—supplies some very important items of evidence. Although it has always been received as œcumenical, it was not attended by any Western bishops, nor was the Pope so much as represented by any deputy, although the Roman Church is bound by the decrees which were passed. The second canon of the Council forbids all bishops to go beyond their own borders, or to interfere in other dioceses; and confirms the privileges allowed to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch by the Council of Nicæa, besides further enacting that the affairs of the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian dioceses shall be administered by their own bishops only, and that the synod of each province shall administer the affairs of the province; which is a virtual repeal of the Canons of Sardica. Canon iii. enacts that the Bishop of Constantinople shall have prece-

dence of honour next after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome; an argument of no weight whatever, if the precedence of Rome were due to religious, not civil and political, reasons.

9. Nine Councils, presided over by various Popes, were held in Rome in the fourth century; but only one Canon is relevant, the first of those enacted by the Synod in 386 under Pope Siricius, for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline in Africa, and it merely forbids the consecration of a Bishop without the knowledge of the Roman Patriarch. Nothing is said as to his consent.

10. In a Council of the whole African Church held at Carthage in 419, Faustinus, Bishop of Potenza, one of the legates of the Popes Zosimus and Boniface I., claimed that the right of appeal to Rome, given by the Sardican Canons cited above, which he alleged to be Canons of the Council of Nicæa, should be allowed by the African Church. Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, immediately challenged their authenticity, as he had never seen them in any copy of the Nicene Canons, and proposed that envoys should be sent to Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople to verify the fact. This was at first rejected, as tending to cast a doubt on the Pope's integrity, though subsequently acted upon; and it was then proposed to write to him to examine the question for himself; but this was not carried out. Then the genuine Nicene Canons were read, as also those of previous African Councils, and re-affirmed. Next, the case of Apiarius, a deposed and excommunicated priest, who had appealed to Rome and had been re-admitted to communion by Pope Zosimus, was considered anew on the grounds alleged by Faustinus, and was settled by letting the matter stand over till the Canons had been verified, and by enacting a new Canon (cxxv.) forbidding for the future all appeals beyond sea, or to any authority save African Councils and Primates, under pain of excommunication throughout Africa; and, finally, the Council sent a synodical letter to Pope Boniface by two legates, complaining of his conduct in reinstating Apiarius, disputing the genuineness of the Canons alleged by Faustinus, and telling the Pope in the plainest language that nothing should make them tolerate his conduct, or suffer such insolence (*typhum*) at his hands. One of the signatories of this epistle was S. Augustine.

Another Council, also held at Carthage, five years later, in 424, had this business of Apiarius before it again. He had been a second time deposed for immorality, and had got another Pope—Celestine—to rehabilitate him, and to send him back to

Africa with Bishop Faustinus to obtain his reinstatement there. But his guilt was proved at the Council by his own confession, and his degradation confirmed. Hereupon the Fathers wrote to Pope Celestine, telling him that they had ascertained that the alleged Nicene Canons were not of that Council at all ; that the Pope had transgressed the genuine Nicene Canons by interfering in another province ; and that they could find no authority for his undertaking to send legates to them or any other Churches, so that they begged him to refrain from doing so in future, for fear the Church should suffer through pride and ambition : and added that they were quite competent, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, to manage their own affairs on the spot, better than he, with less local knowledge, could do for them at Rome ; ending by telling him that they had had quite enough of Faustinus, and wanted no more of him.

11. The third General Council, that of Ephesus in 431, was held in consequence of the failure of Pope Celestine to check the heresy of Nestorius by condemning it in a merely local Roman Synod, and by threatening him with excommunication and deposition in case he refused to retract. No practical impression was made on Nestorius or the bishops of his party thereby, and the Pope joined in a petition to the Emperor to convoke a General Council as the only means of settling the dispute ; while Nestorius himself was duly invited to attend in his episcopal capacity, and to take his seat, although the time prescribed by the Pope for his retraction had long expired. The Council was presided over by S. Cyril of Alexandria, the most powerful prelate of his time, and two of its canons have an important bearing on subsequent events. They are : Canon vii., which enacts the penalty of deposition against any bishop or priest innovating on or varying the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed ; and Canon viii., which, after disallowing the claim of the Patriarch of Antioch to ordain in Cyprus, unless he could prove such to have been the ancient usage, enacts that in all other dioceses and provinces no bishop shall invade any province which was not from the beginning under his jurisdiction or that of his predecessors :—

‘And if any should so occupy one, or forcibly subject it to himself, let him make personal restitution, lest the statutes of the Fathers should be violated, and lest the pride of power should creep in under the pretext of a sacred office, and thus we might unknowingly and gradually lose that freedom which Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour of all men obtained for us with His precious blood, and bestowed upon us.’

12. The fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451,

has more than one disproof of the Petrine claims in its decrees. Its ninth Canon, on ecclesiastical appeals (of which Canon xvii. is little more than a reiteration), directs litigants to apply to the diocesan bishop. If he, or any other bishop, be himself one of the parties to the suit, it is to be carried before the provincial synod. If a metropolitan be one of the parties concerned, the exarch, or primate of the region, is to take cognisance of the case; and, in the last resort, the Patriarch of the imperial city of Constantinople is to decide as final arbiter. The Canon seems to apply to the whole Church, in which case it means that appeals were now made to lie from Rome itself to Constantinople; but it cannot possibly mean less than that no appeal lay from Constantinople to Rome, nor than the formal reversal of the Sardican Canons. But the decrees of this General Council also contain what is perhaps the weightiest item of synodical testimony as yet adduced. In Canon xxviii. the Council decreed as follows:—

‘In all respects following the definitions of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon of the 150 God-beloved bishops which has just been read, we likewise make the same definition and decree concerning the precedence of the most holy Church of Constantinople, or New Rome. For the Fathers with good reason bestowed precedence on the chair of Old Rome, *because it was the imperial city* (διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην), and the 150 God-beloved bishops, moved by the same view, conferred equal precedence on the most holy throne of New Rome, rightly judging that the city honoured with the empire and the senate should enjoy the same precedence as Rome, the old seat of empire, and should be magnified as it was, in ecclesiastical matters also, being second after it.’

And the Canon then proceeds to confer on the Patriarch of Constantinople the right of ordaining all the metropolitans of Asia, Pontus, Thrace, and the bishops in barbarous regions. The Roman legates refused to be present when the Canon was passed, and demanded another session of the Council to abrogate it, producing a forged version of the sixth Canon of Nicæa, in which the words, ‘The Roman see hath always had the primacy,’ had been interpolated, and alleging besides that force had been used to compel the bishops to sign the Canon. The conciliar judges, however, after hearing the objections, ruled that the alleged Canon of Nicæa was unauthentic; that the Roman Bishop had merely a priority of honour, but that the Patriarch of Constantinople was his equal in all solid privileges; and, after the assembled bishops had publicly denied that they acted under compulsion, decided that the Canon must stand.

The Pope, S. Leo the Great, resisted this Canon always, and even professed to annul it, yet on the purely technical grounds that it conflicted with the sixth Nicene Canon, which gave the second place to Alexandria, and trenched besides on the rights of many Metropolitans (*Epist.* lxxix.), not on its contradiction of the privilege of Peter, but he was unable to prevent its execution, or to affect its validity. There is no question at all as to its entire genuineness, as to its being a mere gloss upon and expansion of Canon iii. of Constantinople I., or as to the formality with which it was discussed in the Council, so that it is fully enforced on Roman Catholic acceptance by the three professions of adherence to *all* decrees, without exception, of the General Councils, cited above. And thus we are faced by one or other of the following conclusions. Either the Council, in holding that the Roman primacy is a mere human and ecclesiastical dignity, conferred by the Church, and not a divine and inalienable privilege, was wrong on the point of fact, or it was right. If it were wrong (apart from the objection that then the whole fabric of Conciliar authority falls, as no Council has ever been more authoritative, or more definitely acknowledged by the Roman Church itself), then, since its dogmatic decrees are allowed to be the standard of orthodoxy, and yet as it must have erred in dogma if the Roman primacy be matter of faith, the conclusion is, that the said primacy is not matter of dogmatic faith, but only of history; and so the Canon supplies proof that the Church of the fifth century did not hold the Papal claim to be of divine origin or theological obligation. On the other hand, if the Council was right on the point of fact, there is nothing left to be said in favour of even the historical character of the alleged Petrine privilege.

There is no difficulty in bringing the matter to a decisive test. If the allegation of the Council be true, that the civil position of Rome was the sole cause of its ecclesiastical primacy, then the same principle will be found to affect the precedence of other great sees. On the other hand, if the Ultramontane contention be true, then the rival principle will be seen at work, and the sees will be found to rank according to the dignity of their founders or the august character of their traditions. It is not questioned that it was regarded as a high distinction for any see to be entitled to the epithet of Apostolic, and to count an Apostle as its first originator, if not as its earliest bishop (just as it is a feather in the cap of a school or a society in modern England to be of Royal foundation), but the strong practical good sense which marked

the organisation of the early Church was not likely to sacrifice convenience to sentiment.

Accordingly, although Jerusalem had the highest claim of all in point of origin, having been founded as a Church by Christ Himself, and organised as a diocese under S. James by the whole College of Apostles, as Hegesippus, cited by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23), records for us, yet in consequence of its political insignificance, notably after its replacement by Ælia Capitolina under Hadrian, it was at first a mere suffraganate of the Metropolitan of Cæsarea, himself subject to the Patriarch of Antioch—a rank comparable to that of Sodor and Man amongst English sees. It was not till the Council of Nicæa that the Bishop of Jerusalem was given a certain honorary precedence, because of the august memories attached to his see, but even then saving all the rights of his metropolitan over him (*Can.* vii.), and not till the Council of Chalcedon in 451 did Juvenal, forty-fourth Bishop of Jerusalem, obtain the elevation of his see to the Patriarchal rank which it has ever since held, though always last in order, and narrowest in area of jurisdiction. On the other hand, Alexandria, which never claimed any higher ecclesiastical title than that of the 'Evangelical See,' as founded by S. Mark, was the second city of the Roman Empire, and so was placed next to Rome ecclesiastically also, first informally *de facto*, and then formally *de jure* by the Council of Nicæa. Similarly, Antioch, the third great see of Christendom, was the third city of the Empire (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3), but although it had a more illustrious origin as a diocese than Alexandria, as having been not only undoubtedly founded by Apostles, but alleged to have been for seven years the see of S. Peter himself, it never attained precedence over the more important capital of Egypt. And Ephesus, though Apostolic by at least two claims, through S. Paul and S. John, never rose to higher rank than that of exarchate or primacy. In truth, no Pauline see (unless we account Rome such) was ever placed in the first rank, and many which S. Paul founded continued as mere suffraganates of cities greater in civil importance.¹

¹ Here is the place to mention a linguistic ambiguity of which Roman controversialists have not been slow to avail themselves. The Latin language, unlike Greek, English, French, and German, has no words such as *a* and *the* to express the difference between that which is definite and that which is indefinite, and the context alone gives any clue to the distinction, but cannot always do so. Consequently, if we have Rome entitled *Sedes Apostolica* by an ancient Latin writer, it need mean no more than '*an* Apostolic See,' one of the many dioceses founded by an Apostle. But they now invariably translate it as '*the* Apostolic

S. Cyprian gives as the reason for the precedence of Rome over Carthage, that it was a larger and more important city :—

‘Plainly because Rome ought to precede Carthage by reason of its size (*pro magnitudine sua*), Novatus committed greater and graver offences there. He who made a deacon here against the Church, made a bishop there.’—*Ep. xlix. ad Cornel. Papam.*

The principle had, in fact, been laid down by the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), more than a century earlier than Chalcedon, in its ninth Canon :—

‘It is fit that the bishops in every province should know that the bishop presiding in the chief city (metropolis) is to have superintendence of the whole province, because all people who have business come together from all quarters to the chief city: for which reason it has seemed good that he should have precedence in honour also, and that the other bishops should do nothing important without him, but only such things as concern each one’s diocese and its dependencies, adhering to the ancient rule of our fathers.’

This Canon seems to give the best explanation of a very obscure sentence in S. Irenæus, on which Ultramontanes lay great stress: a passage where the Greek is lost, and the very barbarous Latin translation alone is extant. It runs thus :—

‘For it is necessary that every Church should come together to this [Roman] Church, because of its preferable [*or more powerful*] principality (*Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiozem [al. potentiozem] principalityatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam*).’—*Adv. Hær. III. iii. 2.*

In the absence of the original text, it cannot be said what stood there, so the passage does not satisfy the two primary requirements of Canon law, as being either the original document or free from ambiguity. The Ultramontane gloss is that the words imply superior authority as of divine right. A second view, based on a conjectural restoration of the Greek text, as having had the word *ἀρχαιότητα* for *principalityatem*, and on

See, implying a monopoly of that title and any attendant privileges. But in fact the epithet was common to many such Churches in early times. Thus Tertullian says: ‘Cast a glance over the Apostolic Churches, in which the very thrones of the Apostles are still pre-eminent in their places . . . Achaia is very near you, in which you find Corinth . . . you have Philippi . . . you have the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you find Ephesus. Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome.’—*De Præscript. Hæres. xxxvi.* We do get the definite article prefixed, and that by the second General Council (Constantinople), but the Church so distinguished is Antioch, described by the Fathers as ‘the most ancient and truly Apostolic Church, in Antioch of Syria’ (*τῆς δὲ πρεσβυτάτης καὶ ἀνωτατοῦς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας*).—Theodoret, *H. E. v. 9.*

the fact that the word *principalis* is used elsewhere in the Latin version to mean first in order of *time*, is that S. Irenæus refers here to the superior antiquity of the Roman Church, confessedly the oldest in the West. But the simplest and most obvious interpretation is to take the Councils of Antioch and Chalcedon as our guides, and so to understand the reference to be to the position of Rome as the capital city of the Empire, and thus as possessing in a pre-eminent degree the qualities of civil precedence and of habitual resort of a great concourse of visitors. As a fact, the Eastern part of the Roman Empire was so much more populous and prosperous than the West at this time, that no Western city, except Milan, was thought of sufficient importance to be made the head of a greater province or exarchate, such as Cæsarea, Ephesus, and Heraclea, themselves inferior to the Patriarchal sees, were in the East. And Milan remained absolutely independent of Rome till 571, nor was it effectually brought under Papal authority till S. Gregory the Great availed himself of a vacancy in the see at a very troubled time (592) to interfere in its concerns and to send a legate thither.

Thus the evidence of Church history amply justifies the Fathers of Chalcedon, and proves that they were right in alleging that the political supremacy of Rome as the capital of the Empire, making it the natural centre of all business affairs, and the chief resort of travellers from all quarters, made it also the most convenient centre for that great missionary organisation, whose battle was emphatically fought in the large towns, as the now significant word 'pagan,' once meaning 'rustic' or 'villager,' teaches us.

It may not be inappropriate to remark that in the French Church, although the titular dignity of 'Primate of all the Gauls' is still preserved to the Archbishop of Lyons, yet the virtual primacy has long been in the hands of the Archbishop of Paris, albeit that capital was only a suffragan see of the Province of Sens until 1622, when it was raised to metropolitan rank.

13. Twelve Roman Synods were held under various Popes during the fifth century. The only relevant decrees are the deposition of Nestorius by the Council of 430 under Pope Celestine, disregarded, as we have seen, by the Council of Ephesus; the sentence of the Synod of 445 under Leo the Great, restoring Chelidonius, Bishop of Besançon, who had been synodically deposed by his metropolitan, S. Hilary of Arles, and by S. Germanus of Auxerre, and excommunicating the former for insisting on his metropolitan rights and deny-

ing the Pope's title to hear the appeal, on the merits of which Leo was in truth entirely deceived by the appellant—but S. Hilary's resistance, never retracted, has not prevented him from being a Saint and Doctor of the Roman Church; the fifth Canon of the Synod of 465, forbidding a bishop to name his successor—a virtual repudiation of the devolution from S. Peter to Linus; the condemnation of Acacius of Constantinople and Peter of Alexandria by Felix III. in 484, which, instead of being received in the East, was met by a retaliatory excommunication of the Pope, and caused a schism of thirty-five years, healed at last by a compromise; and the famous Synod of 496 under Pope Gelasius, in which apocryphal books were condemned, the accredited Councils acknowledged, and the writings of certain Fathers, inclusive of SS. Cyprian, Basil, and Augustine, declared entirely orthodox; thus cutting off objections to much of the evidence marshalled hitherto against the Petrine privilege. There was also a definition of the limits of the ecclesiastical and secular powers given by the Pope in this Council, ending with the words: 'It is the duty of Pontiffs to obey the imperial ordinances in all things temporal.' Ten other local Councils were held in this century, at Turin, Milevi, Zella or Telepta, Riez, Orange I., Vaison I., Arles II., Angers, Tours I., and Vannes. All they yield is that at Turin in 401 the Council adjudged the primacy of Narbonne for life to Proculus of Marseilles, though bishop in another province, decreeing that after his death the new Primate should be one of the bishops of the province of Narbonne; and that the dispute between the Archbishops of Arles and Vienne, who both claimed the primacy of Viennese Gaul, should be settled by giving the metropolitanate to whichever claimant could prove his see to be the civil capital of the province—another item of evidence in favour of Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon—while no hint of reference to the Pope as arbiter occurs; and that at Zella in 418, the letter of Pope Siricius drafted in the Roman synod of 386 was read, and an exception allowed in the Roman Church to the general rule requiring three bishops to consecrate another.

14. There is a curious piece of evidence at the beginning of the sixth century which looks at first as though making for the Papal claims, but which proves all the more against them because of the peculiar circumstances.

The Bishops of Italy, excepting the northern portions within the provinces of Milan and Grado or Aquileia, have always been zealous upholders of the Papal claims—indeed the

most so of any section of the episcopate, till the comparatively modern development of bishops *in partibus* as a class. The Pope, as their immediate superior, exercising direct practical jurisdiction over them, has necessarily been a more important personage in their eyes, and been treated by them with a profounder deference, than is the case in other parts of the Latin obedience; and consequently, while acts of submission on their part prove very little, any display of independence proves a great deal. It happened that Pope Symmachus, who sat from 498 to 514, was accused of very grave crimes before Theodoric the Ostrogoth, who compelled the reluctant bishops of the suburbicarian provinces of Italy to hold a council to try the Pope. Symmachus himself had the good sense to see that nothing else could possibly clear him, and accordingly a synod of seventy-six bishops was convened at Rome in 501, known in history as the Synodus Palmaris. It displayed the utmost unwillingness to assume any judicial authority whatever, and several of the prelates expressed their opinion that, as the Pope's inferiors, they were not competent to try him at all, while some went further, and at least implied that only God could decide a cause wherein so august a personage was the defendant. But although they studiously avoided using the legal forms of a trial, still, in order to rehabilitate the Pope, they were obliged to embody their acquittal in the shape of a decree, in which they empowered him to administer the sacraments in all churches attached to his see, and recommended the faithful to receive the Holy Communion at his hands, in token that the strife was now ended, and his innocence established; whereby, despite their reclamation, they proved that it was in their power to have forbidden him to administer the sacraments and the laity to receive them from him, and so that even as a mere local synod, with no pretensions to œcumenicity, they collectively were the Pope's superiors. Symmachus had been acquitted by another Council of 116 bishops in the previous year, but as the forms of a regular trial were evaded then also, that acquittal affords no evidence as to his accountability to a local synod, and it might be explained as no more than a public and official vote of confidence, which, however gratifying and morally influential, could have no canonically legal force in respect of one of his exalted rank. The importance of this synod, as disproving the Gallican theory, that although the Pope is accountable and inferior to the rare and exceptional tribunal of a General Council, nothing less may take cognisance of his acts, or presume to judge him, cannot be overrated.

The sixth century was an era of Councils in the Churches of Gaul and Spain, held for doctrinal and disciplinary purposes, and at once so numerous, and dealing with so large a number of important and even vital topics, that it is all but impossible to believe that if the Papal claims had been then recognised as valid in Western Christendom, there should not be a large mass of evidence forthcoming on their behalf. These Councils were as follows:—In France, Agde, Arles (two); Autun, Auvergne (two); Auxerre, Carpentras, Epäon, Lyons (three); Mâcon (three); Narbonne, Orange, Orleans (five); Paris (three); Tours; and Vaison: in Spain, Barcelona (two); Braga (two); Gerona, Huesca, Lerida, Saragossa, Seville, Tarragona, Toledo (three); Valencia (two): total, forty-two synods. In all these there is but *one* reference, direct or indirect, to the Pope in any capacity, and that is the fourth Canon of Vaison II. in 529 (at which only twelve Bishops were present), enjoining the commemoration of the Pope's name, to be prayed for at every Mass; which incidentally proves that it was not inserted in the Gallican Missal till then, but was absent, as in all the oldest Liturgies except the local Roman one, so that even the bare Primacy was not formally recognised in Gaul at that time, for the local Metropolitan's name must have occupied the first place of commemoration at Mass. There are many Canons, moreover, practically inconsistent with the later system, of which a single example will suffice—the first Canon of the Second Council of Lyons in 567, which decrees that if a dispute arise between two bishops of the same province, the matter is to be settled by their metropolitan and his comprovincials; but if the disputants should be of different provinces, then the two metropolitans are jointly to try the case, and their sentence is to be final. The importance of this Canon is in showing that the great province of Lyons, the principal see of all Gaul, did not then accept or recognise the Canons of Sardica, on which the whole system of Papal appeals is based, for there is no provision for any ulterior appeal.

The fifth General Council at Constantinople in 553 supplies an important piece of evidence. The Council had before it a proposal to condemn, in confirmation of an edict of Justinian I. in 547, certain writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, technically known as the 'Three Chapters.' Pope Vigilius at first had refused assent to the edict of 547, and even declined to communicate with the bishops who had signed it. But in 551 he issued a treatise entitled *Judicatum*, in which he recanted

this first opinion, and condemned the Three Chapters himself in a Synod of seventy Bishops. Hereupon, he was promptly excommunicated by Facundus, Pontianus, and other African bishops, and by the Bishops of Illyricum, as well as strongly censured by Rusticus and Sebastian, deacons of his own Roman Church, while even the Emperor was almost equally angry because of a saving clause in the *Judicatum*, limiting its censures to what was disallowed by the Council of Chalcedon. While the Council of Constantinople was debating the 'Three Chapters,' the Pope changed his mind again, and sent a formal decree or '*constitutum*' to be read in the session, wherein, although rejecting the tenets of Theodore of Mopsestia, he revoked his censure of Theodoret and Ibas, forbade the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and denied the lawfulness of anathematising the dead. But the Council refused to permit this letter to be so much as read, proceeded to condemn the Three Chapters in despite of the Pope's advocacy, and struck his name out of the diptychs or registers of the Church—a virtual act of excommunication—as a punishment for his contumacy. When its decrees were issued, Vigilius recanted once more, and, pleading the *Retractions* of S. Augustine as a precedent, approved the Council, and condemned the Three Chapters afresh, in which he was followed by his successors Pelagius I., John III., Benedict I., Pelagius II., and S. Gregory the Great. Whether we look to the contemptuous disregard of the Pope exhibited by the Œcumenical Council, or to his own helpless vacillations on the doctrinal issue at stake, the result is equally unfavourable to the Petrine claims.

Ten Roman Councils were held in the sixth century. Only two are relevant besides the Synodus Palmaris already cited. In 531 a Synod was held to discuss the appeal of Stephen of Larissa, Metropolitan of Thessaly, who had been deposed by Epiphanius of Constantinople. It is not known how the matter ended, but the plea set up by Stephen was that his see belonged in fact to the Roman Patriarchate, and not to that of Constantinople, and so the question was purely one of ecclesiastical geography, pertaining to an old dispute as to the whole vast province of Eastern Illyricum, claimed by the Popes from Damasus onward as part of their jurisdiction. In 595, John of Chalcedon, a priest who had appealed from the Patriarch of Constantinople, was absolved.

The seventh century also had several Councils held in Gaul and Spain during its course, namely, Autun, Châlons-sur-Saône, Paris, Rheims, and Rouen, in the former country ;

Braga, Egara, Seville, Toledo (fourteen), in the latter: a total of twenty-two. All they yield on inquiry are—(1) that the fifth Council of Paris, in 615, decrees that on the death of any Bishop, the vacancy shall be filled up by the election of a fit person by the clergy and laity of the diocese, to be confirmed by the metropolitan and his comprovincials; and enacts that any other method of appointment shall, in accordance with the ancient Canons, be absolutely void, even if the person be consecrated. There is no provision for appeal to Rome, much less for giving the Pope any voice in the election. (2.) A similar but briefer Canon was passed at Châlons in 649. (3.) The second Council of Seville, in 618, rules that in case of a dispute between bishops as to their jurisdiction over parishes and churches, thirty years' prescription is to confer full rights, 'for this both the edicts of secular princes enjoin and the authority of Roman prelates has decreed.' (4.) The third Canon of the fourth Council of Toledo, in 633, enacts that a general [national] Council of Spain shall be held yearly, if any question of the faith arise, or any matter affecting the Church at large; but that if nothing of such importance be forthcoming, it shall suffice to hold the several provincial synods independently, whenever the metropolitans shall appoint, and the judgment of those synods, whether general or provincial, shall be binding and final, for all causes brought before them. (5.) The sixth Canon of this same Council, in regulating the controversy as to trine and single immersion in baptism, quotes the opinion of S. Gregory the Great in these terms: 'Therefore Gregory of blessed memory, Pontiff of the Roman Church, who not merely adorned the regions of Italy, but taught the Churches also with his doctrine, when the most holy Bishop Leander inquired of him which practice should be followed in this diversity in Spain, writes back to him, saying thus amongst other matters: ' [Here follows a quotation, declaring that both usages are valid and permissible.] 'Wherefore . . . since an opinion is given by so great a man [*tanto viro*] that both are right and to be accounted blameless in the Church of God . . . let us hold to single baptism.' Here it is the personal eminence of S. Gregory as a private doctor, not his official character as Pope, which is cited as weighty in deciding the controversy. (6.) The fourteenth Council of Toledo, in 684, assembled to give local confirmation in Spain to the decrees of Constantinople against the Apollinarians and Monothelites, having been 'invited' by Pope Leo II. to do so, and the Council explained that there were two reasons for not having earlier

complied with the invitation, namely, that a General Council of Spain had been held just before the Pope's letter arrived, and had been dissolved, while the severity of an unusually cold and stormy winter made it highly inconvenient to reassemble, but that the decrees had been carefully studied in each diocese, and approved, so that now they were ready to content the Pope by giving clear proof of their orthodoxy in affirmatory Canons. There is not a word in their language which implies any uneasiness lest they should seem insufficiently deferential to the Pope, but only lest their submission to and agreement with the Œcumenical Council should be doubted because of the delay. A Council at Rome, under Pope Agatho, in 678, decreed the reinstatement of Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, who complained of having been unjustly deposed, and of his diocese being divided into three sees against his will. But the sentence was disregarded by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in England, who, some years later, actually renewed his deposition, and never retracted the partition of his diocese, but even carved a fourth see out of it. This is the sum of the local conciliar evidence furnished by the seventh century; but an incomparably weightier testimony has yet to be adduced, that of the sixth General Council, the last of the undisputed Œcumenical Synods of the Church Catholic.

That Council was held in 681 for the condemnation of the Monothelite heresy, and the legates of Pope Agatho took the lead in calling for that condemnation, and in vindicating the orthodox Catholic doctrine, bringing with them letters to the Emperor from the Pope and a Council of Western bishops which had assembled at Rome in 679. The result was that in the several sessions judgment was pronounced in these terms:—

(a.) Sess. xiii.—‘It has been demanded that sentence shall be pronounced on the epistles of Sergius, *Honorius*, and Sophronius, which were read in the preceding session. The Holy Council said: According to the promise which was made by us to your Splendour, we, taking into consideration the dogmatic epistles which were written by Sergius, Patriarch of the Imperial City, both to Cyrus, who was then Bishop of Phasis, and also to Honorius, Pope of Old Rome, and likewise the epistle in reply from him, that is, Honorius, to the aforesaid Sergius, and finding them to be in all respects alien from Apostolic doctrine and from the definitions of the sacred synods, and of all the Fathers of repute, but following the false doctrines of the heretics, we wholly reject them, and pronounce them accursed as hurtful to souls. . . . With these we have provided that *Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome, be cast out of the Holy Catholic Church of*

God and be anathematized, because we have found by the writings which he addressed to Sergius, that he followed his opinion in all respects and affirmed his impious tenets.'

(b.) 'Having examined the letters of Sergius, of Constantinople to Cyrus, and the answer of Honorius to Sergius, and having found them to be repugnant to the doctrine of the Apostles, and to the opinion of all the Fathers; in execrating their impious dogmas, we judge that their very names ought to be banished from the Holy Church of God; we declare them to be smitten with anathema; and together with them, *we judge that Honorius, formerly Pope of Old Rome, be anathematized, since we find in his letters to Sergius that he follows in all respects his error and authorises his impious doctrine.*'

(c.) Sess. xvi.—'Anathema to Theodore the heretic, anathema to Sergius the heretic, anathema to Cyrus the heretic, anathema to *Honorius the heretic*, anathema to Pyrrhus the heretic.'

(d.) Sess. xvii.—'But since there has never, from the beginning, ceased to be an inventor of evil, who found the serpent to help him, and thereby brought poisoned death on mankind, and so finding suitable tools for his own purpose,—we mean Theodorus . . . and also Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome.'

These decrees were signed, without any objection being raised, by the legates of Pope Agatho and by all the hundred and sixty-five bishops present.

This sentence on a Pope as a heretic, pronounced by a General Council, is such a deadly blow to the whole fabric of the Papal claims, as negating at once the doctrines of Papal supremacy and infallibility, that the most desperate efforts have been made by Roman controversialists to elude or minimise its evidence. It is unnecessary to set down all these shifts and evasions here, and it will suffice to name such of them as would be to the point if they could be proved.

1. Baronius alleges that the insertion of Honorius's name is an interpolation and forgery.

2. Honorius was really orthodox, and was condemned by the Council in error.

3. Honorius was condemned only in his capacity as a private doctor, as he did not put forth his letter to Sergius in his official capacity, nor intend to teach *ex cathedra* by it.

4. The fault for which Honorius was condemned was not heresy, but apathetic negligence in suppressing the heresy of others.

It may be observed, in the first place, that these four excuses are not *supplementary* to each other, so as to be separate pleas or parts which can be combined into one successful defence. Each of them *excludes* the other three, and is incompatible with them, so that the controversialist who selects

any one of them in defence of Honorius must deny the truth of the three remaining pleas, and if he attempt to urge more than one of them simultaneously, he must contradict himself. Thus, it is plainly inconsistent to declare the Acts of the Council to be *forged*, and also to say that, although *genuine*, they were passed in error on the point of the Pope's orthodoxy. One of these two pleas might be true by itself, but they cannot both be true at the same time. As a fact, the four pleas are all false.

Not only was there no suspicion or whisper of interpolation in the Acts of the Council during the nine hundred years which elapsed between the publication of its decrees in 681, and that of the first volume of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Baronius in 1588; but the most explicit and authoritative acceptance of those decrees by the local Church of Rome itself is attested by irrefragable documentary proof. First, the anathema against Honorius does not rest for evidence on the Acts of the Council only. It is expressly repeated in the letter of the Council to the Emperor, and in its other letter to Pope Agatho, and all these three documents were duly signed by the Papal legates. Next, Pope Leo II., Agatho's successor, wrote to the Emperor, on May 7, 683, a formal letter, in which he says, amidst much else: 'We likewise *anathematise* the inventors of the new error; that is, Theodore . . . Sergius . . . and also *Honorius*, who did not keep this Apostolic Church pure with doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but endeavoured to overthrow the unspotted faith by his profane betrayal.' Thirdly, this same Pope renewed this anathema in his letter to the Spanish bishops, inviting them to accept synodically the decrees of the Council, in which he tells them that Honorius is damned to all eternity. Fourthly, the two synods, at Nicæa in 787 and Constantinople in 869, reckoned by the Latin Church as the seventh and eighth General Councils—of which the latter, held against Photius, and entirely under Roman influence, is rejected by the Greeks—renew the condemnation of Honorius. The following citation of the Acts of the pseudo-Œcumenical Council of Constantinople is from the account by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a Roman historian and divine, who was present during the sessions: 'We anathematize, moreover, Theodore, who was Bishop of Pharan, and Sergius, and Pyrrhus, and Paul, and Peter, impious bishops of the Church of Constantinople; and together with them Honorius of Rome, together with Cyrus of Alexandria; and also Macarius of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen, who, following the doctrines of Apollinaris of evil

fame, and also of Eutyches and Severus, the impious here-siarchs, taught that the Flesh of God was animated by a rational and intellectual soul devoid of operation and will, with mutilated senses, and in both without reasoning faculty.' Fifthly, a formal Profession of Faith, to be made by each Pope at his coronation, was inserted in the *Liber Diurnus*, itself drawn up, as is believed, by Pope Gregory II., one clause of which, in condemnation of heresies, mentions Honorius by name, along with Sergius, Pyrrhus, and others, with the special remark that he 'added fuel (*fomentum*) to their corrupt statements.' Sixthly, in the office of the Roman Breviary for June 28, the feast of S. Leo II., the name of Pope Honorius was included for some centuries in the lessons of the second nocturn, amongst those Monothelite heretics who were condemned by the sixth General Council. The lesson has been falsified, ever since the sixteenth century, by omitting Honorius's name; but the older editions, when not actually mutilated with a knife, exhibit it still. Seventhly, a letter of Pope Hadrian II., formally drafted in a Council at Rome in 868, was read in the so-called eighth General Council of 869, in which he lays down very strong assertions as to the privileges of the Roman See, stating that as a rule no Pope can be tried by his inferiors; that the only ground on which he may be lawfully resisted is that of heresy; and that the posthumous condemnation of Honorius by the sixth General Council rests on that ground, and must needs have been preceded by permission from the then Pope to the assembled patriarchs and bishops to moot the question at all. This very claim, intended to exalt the privilege of Peter, establishes two facts, that in Pope Hadrian's mind Honorius was really and justly condemned as a heretic, and that the previous assent of Pope Agatho to the condemnation was brought by his legates to the Council. The question of the *truth* of the charge, and of the official character of the letter of Honorius on which it was based, will be considered when that part of the evidence against the Petrine claims is reached which consists of acts of the Popes themselves; but the present issue is as to the evidence of the Councils. And as all the undisputed General Councils have been cited, each of which contributes its quota of testimony against the alleged 'privilege of Peter,' while more than one hundred local ones in the first seven centuries, to say the least, fail to support it, it will suffice to close this part of the discussion here; but one additional citation, albeit of minor importance, may not be superfluous. It is the first ground of objection raised by the Gallican

Church in the 'Caroline Books,' written by order of Karl the Great, at the close of the eighth century (790), against the sanction of the cultus of images by the quasi-General Second Council of Nicæa in 787. That ground was, that this Council of Nicæa was a merely Eastern synod, as no Western bishops were present *except the Pope by his legates*, and therefore was not œcumenical nor binding; and the French and German bishops held out for at least five centuries before recognising this Council.

Later synods, exclusively Western (except that of Ferrara-Florence, to be considered subsequently), obviously have not the same value as evidence of Catholic consent; and many of them, held under directly Roman influence, and even in the august city itself, might be readily quoted as showing how the Petrine claims were gradually advanced, where little resistance was likely, or even possible. But this very fact increases the weight of any adverse testimony discoverable in them, and such testimony is very far indeed from being absent. It will suffice to quote the decisions of five of the most important—those of Rome in 963; of Sutri in 1046; of Pisa in 1409; of Constance in 1415; and of Basle, which sat from 1431 to 1443. The first of these deposed Pope John XII. for simony, adultery, and other grievous crimes; the second, convened to examine the conflicting claims of three rival Popes—Benedict IX., Silvester III., and Gregory VI.—condemned Silvester as an impostor, degraded him from holy orders, imprisoned him for life, and compelled the abdication of the two others, one of whom must have been the lawful claimant. The words used of Benedict by Pope Victor III. are that he, being Roman Pontiff, gave judgment for his own deposition (*ipse, Romanus Pontifex, se judicaverit deponendum*); and of Gregory VI., almost similarly, 'I judge that I am to be removed from the Roman bishopric' (*a Romano episcopatu judico me submovendum*). These turns of phrase are important, as they exclude the plea of voluntary resignation, and show that submission to the sentence of the Council, in order to mitigate its severity, is the true version of the transactions.

Neither of these Councils professed to be œcumenical. They were no more than local Italian Synods, and yet their depositions of the Popes in question have always been counted valid.

The Council of Pisa, one of the largest ever assembled, met to adjudicate upon the conflicting claims of the rival Popes, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., one of whom, at least, must have been the true Pontiff. It summoned them

to appear before it, convoked as it was under the authority of the two parties in the College of Cardinals which severally adhered to each of the claimants; and after declaring them contumacious for absence and non-representation by proctors, formally withdrew from the recognition of both or either of them, declared in its fourteenth session that it, as representing the Catholic Church, had right of cognisance in the matter, and jurisdiction, as the highest authority on earth; and formally deposed, condemned, and excommunicated both Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., as schismatics, heretics, and perjurers, electing in their stead Peter of Candia, Archbishop of Milan, under the title of Alexander V., who was duly crowned.

The Council of Constance had before it the renewed claims of the two Popes deposed at Pisa, and also those of the actually reigning Pope, Balthasar Cossa, Pope John XXIII., who presided at its opening. His notorious immorality caused several heavy indictments to be brought against him before the Synod, which, in its fourth session, declared itself an Œcumenical Council, deriving its authority directly from Christ Himself—a power which every one, including the Pope, was bound to obey in all matters regarding the Faith, the removal of schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and members. It further pronounced null and void any censures or processes which the Pope might direct against the members of the Council. In the twelfth session John XXIII. was finally deposed, and declared incapable of re-election; while in the forty-first session Cardinal Colonna was elected Pope under the title of Martin V.

The Council of Basle held forty-five sessions. Of these the first twenty-five were received by the Gallican Church, and, indeed, by the entire West; but the whole are now rejected by the Ultramontane school. Of course it has no Eastern recognition whatever. Its value for the present inquiry, therefore, must not rest so much on its disputed claims, as on its historical record of a great body of ecclesiastical opinion in the fifteenth century; since, as Cardinal Manning notes, when quoting it to support the dogma of the Immaculate Conception:—‘And if the Council of Basle be not general, yet it represents the mind of the Episcopate of the Universal Church.’—(*Sermons on Eccl. Subjects*, p. 129. Duffy, 1863.) It was convoked by Martin V., who died just after its meeting, and it came, almost at once, into conflict with his successor Eugenius IV. Amongst the decrees in the acknowledged sessions are the reiteration of

the claim of the Council of Constance to be supreme over all persons, including the Pope; that if the Pope disobey it, or any other General Council, he is to be put to penance; that General Councils are alone infallible, because they are the Church itself, whereas the Pope, though the chief *minister* of the Church, is not above the whole mystical body, since that body cannot err in matters of faith, whereas experience teaches that the Pope can so err; that the Church, as the mystical body, has several times deposed Popes when convicted of error in matters of faith, whereas no Pope has ever pretended to excommunicate the Church as a body; that the Council warned and required Pope Eugenius IV. to revoke his decree for its dissolution, and to appear before it in person or by proxy within three months; that the Pope should not be permitted to create any cardinals during the sitting of the Council, and that any such creation should be null and void; that no person should be excused from attending the Council on the plea of any oath or promise made to the Pope, all such pledges being declared not binding; that the claim put forward by the Bishop of Tarentum that the Pope alone possesses the right of appointing the time, place, and celebration of Councils, could not be sustained, since, if the Pope attempted to dissolve a lawfully convoked Council, he would thereby become an abetter and renewer of schism; that if any Pope neglected to call a Council once in ten years, as decreed at Constance, the right to do so would devolve on the Bishops, without any obligation to ask his permission; that the legates whom Pope Eugenius was willing to send in 1433 to preside over the Council in his name be refused admission, because claiming powers inconsistent with its own; that he be required to revoke within sixty days his plan for transferring the Council from Basle, upon pain of being pronounced contumacious; and that his right of reservation and of reversion to ecclesiastical preferments be restricted to the local Roman diocese and its immediate dependencies. All these decrees were made within the twenty-five acknowledged and received sessions. Amongst those made in the later and disputed sessions are one directing that all causes ecclesiastical should be decided on the spot, and that no appeal to the Pope, to the exclusion of the Ordinary, should be allowed; that Pope Eugenius be pronounced contumacious, be suspended from his office, and all his acts be accounted null and void; that it is a Catholic verity that a General Council has authority over the Pope as well as over all others; that, once lawfully convoked, it cannot be dissolved, transferred,

or prorogued by the Pope's authority against its consent, and that whoso resists these verities is to be regarded as a heretic; while in 1439 the Council declared Eugenius IV. deposed, and elected Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, Pope as Felix V., but this choice was not universally nor favourably recognised.

The most important facts in the history of these later Councils are the depositions of Popes effected at Pisa and Constance, with the elections of Alexander V. and Martin V. in the room of the deprived Pontiffs. It is obvious that if the 'privilege of Peter,' as affirmed in the Vatican Council, be a divinely revealed verity, and the Pope be in truth the Head of the Church, his inferiors could not possibly sit in judgment upon him, nor could the Body, without committing suicide, cut off its own Head. Therefore, if the attitude taken up by the Councils were heterodox and unjustifiable, we should find their nominees to the Papacy rejected as pretenders, schismatics, and heretics, and their acts disallowed as null and void.

Precisely so in English history, the whole Parliamentary annals of England under the Commonwealth are now a legal blank. The trial and condemnation of Charles I. are regarded as illegally done; the reign of Oliver Cromwell, politically important as it was, and the statutes of his Parliaments, many of them wise and salutary, and anticipatory (as in the union of Scotland and Ireland into one realm with England) of much later legislation, are simply ignored; the regnal years of Charles II. are counted from the day of his father's execution; and no Acts of Parliament nor decisions of the law-courts between 1641 and 1660 can be cited as of authority, or as having the smallest legal validity. But no such disavowal of Pisa and Constance exists in ecclesiastical history, and the claims of Alexander V. and Martin V. to be true Pontiffs and successors of S. Peter have never been disputed; albeit their title depends wholly on the validity of the deposition of their predecessors, which created the vacancies in their favour. Had there been any such collapse of the opposition at Pisa and Constance as that which left Eugenius IV. ultimately victor over the Council of Basle, we should have merely proof that modern Ultramontaniam was not then universally received, but none that it was not in the right, and entitled to be so received; but the triumph of Pisa and Constance over Papal resistance is decisive of the controversy, and refutes the Vatican decrees of 1870. Thus the three great sources of historical appeal, to wit, the wording of the ancient Liturgies; the glosses of the early Fathers and Doctors of the Church on the alleged Petrine charter in the Gospels; and

the Canons of all the most important Synods ever held in the Church before the era of the Reformation, including every one of the true Œcumenical Councils, are clear in their disproof of claims made for the divine supremacy and infallibility of the occupant of the Roman See, even on the assumption that he is, in virtue of that position, the successor and heir of S. Peter himself—an assumption by no means adequately sustainable.

For, in point of fact, we have no right to make any such assumption at all. The contention on the Ultramontane part, it must be incessantly repeated, is twofold: that the Papal claims are of the nature of *privilege*, and that privilege one *divinely* revealed. It has been shown already that Roman Canon law hedges every claim of privilege round with the most stringent requirements of documentary and illustrative proof, and within the narrowest limits of interpretation and exercise, and also that the tokens of *revelation* which it requires in all other cases are the express letter of Holy Scripture, and—in some instances *or*—the unanimous tradition of the Church Universal. Dreams, visions, miracles, may be, and often are, alleged as ground enough for the canonisation of a departed believer, or for the licensing of some popular devotion, but not for the establishment of any doctrine as an integral part of the Catholic faith, much less in proof of such a strictly legal claim as that of privilege, which from its very nature cannot grow and develop as a prescriptive right often may do, but must always remain within its original limits, unless a fresh grant can be adduced. Thus, for example, an English nobleman whose ancestor had been created a simple baron, might gradually become, from the antiquity and alliances of his family, from wealthy marriages and inheritances, and from a succession of able and distinguished holders of the title, a personage and head of a house of much greater social importance than many persons of far higher rank in the peerage. But that fact would not *make* him a duke, marquis, earl, or even viscount, unless a fresh patent from the Crown conferring that additional dignity, with its attendant privileges, were issued. He could never *grow* into a duke, though he might grow into being a millionaire, or the chief personage in his county. And, similarly, no proof from Church history of vast powers actually exercised by the Popes, nor the clearest evidence of still larger claims having been habitually advanced by themselves or others on their behalf, is a single step towards establishing the existence of a *privilege*. It is ample, and more than ample, testimony for

the growth of a *prescriptive* right, but that form of claim is specifically rejected and declared heretical as a tenet by the Vatican decrees, which teach that there has been no increase or 'ripening' of the authority wielded by the earliest Pontiffs, whose primacy was, they say, a supremacy from the very first. Of their own choice the Popes have elected to rest their case on the 'privilege of Peter;' and even were not the evidence already adduced fatally adverse to the existence of any such privilege—saving that honourable priority in missionary work amongst Jews and Gentiles which is the peculiar inalienable glory of Simon Bar-Jona—there are two huge gaps in the further testimony, which make the production of a continuous chain of proof quite impossible. These gaps are the lack of proof that S. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, and that having received authority to transmit his peculiar privilege, whatever it was, to his successors in that office, he did in fact do so.

Let us take these points in order. It is plain, as regards the first of them, that Holy Scripture is absolutely and ominously silent—nay, that it contains very strongly adverse presumptive evidence. Not merely is there nothing positive to connect S. Peter personally with the city of Rome, as has already been mentioned, except the one ambiguous and disputed reference to Babylon in his first Epistle, but there are certain negative statements which are scarcely reconcilable on any hypothesis with the Ultramontane assertion that S. Peter did actually sit as Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, dying there as a martyr by crucifixion on the very same day, June 29, A.D. 67, as that on which S. Paul was beheaded. The first difficulty is that S. Peter appears as still residing at Jerusalem in A.D. 52, the date of the Council described in Acts xv. 6–30, and considerably later as being at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), which does not give time for the five-and-twenty years required, necessarily beginning in A.D. 41 or 42. It is possible, of course, that these appearances at Jerusalem and Antioch *may* have been brief missionary journeys back to the East from Rome, but that is mere conjectural hypothesis, not Scriptural proof; as also is a modern theory, that S. Peter and the whole infant Roman Church founded by him in A.D. 44, were included in the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius in A.D. 52, that some of these Christians returned in 57, and also S. Peter himself to die in 69, a year or two after S. Paul's martyrdom, and twenty-five years after his own first visit. (Mr. E. B. Birks, in the *Academy*, September 15, 1877.) This is a bold and ingenious guess, but

contradicts much of the scanty evidence which we have remaining, and notably the silence of S. Paul and the Acts as to the first and second points, which could scarcely have been omitted, as will be noted presently. The second difficulty has been stated already, that whereas Rome was the chief of Gentile Churches, S. Peter's jurisdiction was after a time divinely restricted to the Church of the Circumcision (Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9), and could not, so far as we are entitled to judge, be thenceforward exercised over any Gentile Church, unless S. Peter had survived the separate existence of Jewish Christianity, instead of being overlived by it for at least fifty years. Thirdly, the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romans, in the opinion of the best critics, was written about A.D. 57 or 58. The note prefixed to it in the Douai Version assigns it to about the twenty-fourth year after the Ascension, that is to say, A.D. 55. But this Epistle is entirely silent as to the presence of S. Peter or of any other Apostle at Rome then or previously. S. Paul expresses his longing to impart unto them a certain 'spiritual gift, to the end that they may be established' (Rom. i. 11)—words which most probably and reasonably denote his purpose to administer *Confirmation* to them, as SS. Peter and John had done to the Samaritans—a grace (τὸ χάρισμα πνευματικόν is the phrase employed) then bestowed by Apostolic hands alone, and incidentally proving that, as just said, no Apostle had yet reached the imperial city. Next, he declares his readiness (Rom. i. 15) to preach the Gospel at Rome exactly as he had done elsewhere, and adds that it was his custom not to preach in any place where another preacher had been before him 'lest I should build upon another man's foundation' (xv. 20)—that this was a fixed principle with S. Paul appears from another passage, where he says: 'Having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand' (2 Cor. x. 15, 16)—demands their obedience to himself on the ground of his rank as 'the Apostle of the Gentiles' (Rom. i. 5, 6, 7; xi. 13); and while sending greetings to various individuals, families, and even whole congregations in the city (Rom. xvi. 3-16) is entirely mute as to any central or presiding authority amongst them, such as the bishops and elders referred to in other Epistles, albeit Andronicus and Junia, 'of note amongst the Apostles' (xvi. 7), are named as residing there, most probably as prisoners. This absence of all mention of any regular Church

officers and organisation is alone enough to disprove the hypothesis that there was already a settled Church of Rome founded by S. Peter in A.D. 42. The narrative in the last chapter of the Acts brings the chronology down some years further, as far as A.D. 61, but the account of S. Paul's arrival at Rome contains no hint that S. Peter came or sent to him, and actually tells us that the chiefs of the Jewish community there had no more certain acquaintance with the new sect than that 'everywhere it is spoken against' (Acts xxviii. 22)—a degree of ignorance altogether inexplicable if the great preacher on the Day of Pentecost had been settled amongst them as a missionary for nearly twenty years. Nor does the negative evidence cease here. Four, perhaps five, of S. Paul's Epistles seem to have been written during his confinement at Rome—namely, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon, and 2 Timothy, bringing the date down to the very eve of the Apostle's martyrdom ('For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand'—2 Tim. iv. 6), A.D. 65 or 66, but there is still the same absolute silence regarding S. Peter, though S. Paul sends greetings to the Philippians from 'all the saints' at Rome (Phil. iv. 22). He mentions in Colossians that his '*only* fellow-workers' are his messengers to them, Tychicus and Onesimus, together with Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus called Justus, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas—Colos. iv. 7, 9–15; and in 2 Timothy, '*only* Luke' is left (2 Tim. iv. 11); for which reason he asks that Mark may be brought by Timothy to Rome as a worker. The entire unconsciousness which this chain of evidence, from A.D. 58 to 65, displays, on S. Paul's part, of a fact of such first-rate importance to Christianity as S. Peter's presence at Rome as the long-settled chief of the Christian community there, and in fact as head of all Christendom, must on any hypothesis have been, requires that the proof which outweighs such accumulated negative testimony shall be copious, explicit, and cogent. As a fact, it is so scanty, vague, and uncertain, that many eminent scholars have refused to believe that S. Peter was ever so much as even a visitor at Rome; but in this they may be suspected of controversial prejudice and bias.

The whole of the extant evidence on the subject will now be set down, and an attempt made to appraise its value:—

1. S. IGNATIUS († *circa* 107).—'I do not, like Peter and Paul, issue commandments unto you.'—*Epistle to the Romans*, iv.

2. S. DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH (*circa* 165).—'Therefore, you also have by such admonition joined in close union [the Churches] that were planted by Peter and Paul, that of the Romans and that of the

Corinthians : for both of them went to our Corinth, and taught us in the same way as they taught you when they went to Italy, and having taught you, they suffered martyrdom at the same time.'—*Epistle to the Roman Church.*

3. S. IRENÆUS († 202).—(a.) 'Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundation of the Church.'—*Cont. Hæres.* III. i. 1. (b.) 'Indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles, of the very great, very ancient, and universally known Church, founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.'—*Cont. Hæres.* III. iii. 2. (c.) 'The blessed Apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the Episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was assigned the bishopric.'—*Cont. Hæres.* III. 3.¹

4. CAIUS, a learned Roman presbyter (*circa* 200), cited by Eusebius, and conjectured, not without probability, to be indeed Hippolytus.—'But I can show the trophies of the Apostles. For, if you go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Road, you will find the trophies of those who have laid the foundation of the Church.'—Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* II. 25.

5. TERTULLIAN († *circa* 218).—(a.) 'The Church of Rome, in like manner, makes Clement to have been ordained by Peter.'—*De Præscr. Hæres.* 32. (b.) 'Happy Church [of Rome], in which Apostles poured forth their teaching with their blood ; where Peter is made equal to the Passion of the Lord, where Paul is crowned with the departure of John [the Baptist].'—*De Præscr. Hæres.* 36. (c.) 'The Romans . . . to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel, sealed with their blood.'—*Adv. Marcion.* II. iv. 5.

6. S. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA († *circa* 220) is cited by Euse-

¹ The historical value of this testimony of S. Irenæus is much weakened by a passage in an earlier part of his great work, where he asserts that all the elders who knew S. John testify that Our Lord's ministry lasted from His thirtieth year till He was between forty and fifty (II. xxii. 5) ; that is, for more than ten years ; whereas we have certain fixed chronological data in the Gospels to disprove this view : for the Baptist's ministry began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar (A.D. 28 ; or, if that reign be counted from the association of Tiberius with Augustus in the Empire, A.D. 26) and preceded that of Christ. But Pontius Pilate was appointed Procurator of Judea in A.D. 25, and recalled in A.D. 34, and as his government covered the whole period of Our Lord's public ministry, the furthest possible range is seven clear years, which would make Our Lord still under forty at His death, which is fixed by other data to A.D. 30. And the received view of the Roman Church is that A.D. 29 is the true date, following the statements of Tertullian, S. Clement of Alexandria, Julius Africanus, and Lactantius, thereby rejecting the testimony of S. Irenæus on a point where he must certainly have had more evidence to guide him than in his chronology of the Popes ; for although he obtained the latter in mature life, and almost certainly at Rome itself, yet it is clear that the documents there, a very little later, did not agree with his statement.

bis (see later) as mentioning S. Peter's visit to Rome to contend with Simon Magus.

7. S. CYPRIAN (A.D. 250).—‘Cornelius was made bishop . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, and the grade of the sacerdotal chair, was vacant.’

8. *Fragment of the ‘PSEUDO-HIPPOLYTUS’* (circa 250, but in truth a late forgery, borrowed from Origen, see below).—‘Peter preached the Gospel in Pontus, and Galatia, and Cappadocia, and Bithynia, and Italy, and Asia, and was afterwards crucified by Nero in Rome, with his head downwards, and he had himself desired to suffer in that manner.’—*On the Twelve Apostles*.

9. ORIGEN († 254).—‘Peter seems to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion throughout Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, who also, coming at last to Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, having of himself requested to suffer in this manner.’—*Com. in Genesin*, iii., ap. Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* iii. 1.

10. ARNOBIUS († 307).—‘In Rome itself . . . they have hastened to give up their ancestral customs, and to join themselves to Christian truth, for they had seen the chariot of Simon Magus and his fiery car blown into pieces by the mouth of Peter.’—*Adv. Gentes*, ii. 12.

11. S. PETER OF ALEXANDRIA († 311).—‘Thus Peter, the first of the Apostles, having been often arrested and cast into prison, and treated with ignominy, was last of all crucified at Rome.’—*Epist. Canon.* Can. ix.

12. LACTANTIUS (320).—‘His Apostles were dispersed throughout all the earth to preach the Gospel . . . and during twenty-five years, and until the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Nero, they occupied themselves in laying the foundation of the Church in every city and province. And while Nero reigned, the Apostle Peter came to Rome, and, through the power of God committed unto him, wrought certain miracles, and, by turning many to the true faith, built up a faithful and steadfast temple to the Lord. When Nero heard of these things . . . he crucified Peter and slew Paul.’—*De Mort. Persecut.* ii.

13. *Apostolical Constitutions*.—‘And Simon [Magus] meeting me, Peter, first at Cæsarea Stratonis . . . there being with me . . . Nicetus and Aquila, brethren of Clement, the bishop and citizen of Rome, who was the disciple of Paul, our fellow-apostle and fellow-helper in the Gospel, I thrice discoursed before them with him . . . and when I had overcome him . . . I drove him away into Italy. Now, when he was at Rome, he commanded that the people should bring me also by force into the theatre, and promised that he would fly in the air, and when all the people were in suspense at this, I prayed by myself.’ Then follows the legend of Simon Magus's fall.—*Apost. Const.* vi. 9. ‘Of the Church of the Romans, Linus, son of Claudia, was the first [Bishop], ordained by Paul; and Clemens, after Linus's death, the second, ordained by me, Peter.’—vii. 46.

14. *Clementine Homilies*.—‘Simon, who . . . was set apart to be the foundation of the Church, and for this end was by Jesus himself, with His truthful mouth, named Peter . . . having come as far

as Rome . . . by violence exchanged this present existence for life. But about that time, when he was about to die, the brethren being assembled together, he suddenly seized my hand, and rose up, and said in presence of the Church: "Hear me, brethren and fellow-servants . . . I lay hands on this Clement as your Bishop, and to him I intrust my chair of discourse. . . . I communicate to him the power of binding and loosing, so that with respect to everything which he shall ordain on the earth, it shall be decreed in the heavens."—*Epistle to S. James*, i. and ii.

This is the *whole* of the ante-Nicene evidence now extant; for though there is an obscure reference to S. Peter's martyrdom in the Muratorian fragment, it throws no light on the question.¹ And it will be observed that out of the *nineteen* passages of which it consists, *six* mention only S. Peter's martyrdom at Rome, saying nothing whatever of any relation of his to the Church of that city; *three* mention the legend of his contest with Simon Magus as the single interesting fact of his Roman sojourn; *five* name S. Paul in terms of absolute equality with S. Peter in their relation to Rome, but do not define that relation in any way, while one of these five makes Linus, the first Pope, S. Paul's nominee; *one* speaks of S. Peter as having been a worker of miracles and a successful preacher at Rome, which *one* somewhat vaguely describes as his place or see (*locus Petri*); and just *three* speak of him as having ordained Clement as Bishop; while there is only *one* of these three which plainly states in express terms his having been himself Bishop there, and as having appointed Clement as his heir and successor, clothed with all his own authority. But that one is in the apocryphal *Clementine Homilies*, condemned by Pope Gelasius in the Roman Council of 496, and ever since rejected by the Roman Church as the forgery of heretics. And even it is preceded, only a few lines earlier, by the dedication professing to be from Pope Clement to the Apostle James:—"Clement to James, the lord and the bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the Holy Church of the Hebrews, and the Churches everywhere excellently founded by the providence of God, with the elders and deacons, and the rest of the brethren, peace be always;" so that if the authenticity of the document were satisfactorily proved, it would follow that the Pope, albeit the successor of S. Peter, was subordinate to the Apostle S. James, as head of the Church of the Circumcision,

¹ 'Sicut et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat [Lucas], sed et profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.' Here S. Paul's connexion with Rome is implied, but not S. Peter's.

and, in right of his see at Jerusalem, head also of all other Churches throughout the world. As regards the two other testimonies to S. Clement's ordination by S. Peter, the modern Roman Church, by counting S. Linus first and S. Clement third in order of succession, implicitly rejects them, leaving itself thus no ante-Nicene witness except S. Irenæus (3 c.), from whom, however, it has departed, as will be seen (and that at least so far back as fifteen hundred years ago), in two important particulars, and thus has destroyed with its own hand its one solitary appeal.

And it is further to be observed that the *Apostolical Constitutions* contradict the *Clementine Homilies* (and indeed themselves also) on two important historical issues, for they represent S. Peter as calling Clement already Bishop of Rome, before his own journey thither, and S. Paul's disciple, not his.

Finally, in that which is the clearest item of the testimony adduced, that of S. Dionysius of Corinth, that eminent saint declares that the joint relation of S. Peter and S. Paul to Rome was exactly the same as that which they both bore to Corinth, which Church they had united in planting and organising. But we learn from the Acts, and from the Epistles to the Corinthians, that S. Paul was the original evangeliser and chief ecclesiastical authority in the Corinthian Church, though S. Peter's influence there is expressly recognised also (1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22), while not so much as the vaguest tradition points to either Apostle as ever having been locally Bishop there.

Consequently, no tittle of proof is derivable from the fairly copious remains of the ecclesiastical literature of the first three centuries, that S. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, or that he transmitted the peculiar privilege of supremacy and infallibility to his successors in the see. Yet, given the manifest importance of the event, historically and doctrinally, on Ultramontane grounds, it must have been mentioned, more or less explicitly, by the writers cited above, and by others also, if it were true in fact. And if it be urged that the destruction of early Christian literature has been so widespread that there may once have been abundant proofs of the matter in dispute, now lost to us, the reply is conclusive, that in questions of privilege, by Canon law, the document to prove it must be produced, and cannot be merely guessed at as having possibly existed; while, on the other hand, it is equally conceivable that the additional testimony, were it extant, would be unfavourable to the Petrine claims. The documents we still possess are adequate to

convince any mind not biassed by controversial prejudice that S. Peter ended his career at Rome, and by martyrdom, especially as no competing tradition exists, and to make it at least highly probable that he had some share in preaching the Gospel amongst its teeming myriads, as also in building up the infant community. There is, moreover, in all likelihood, a residuum of truth in the story of his contest there with Simon Magus, but more than this cannot be extracted from the ante-Nicene era, save by relying on the one document which the Roman Church has formally repudiated. As we come lower down, the statements do get more precise, but it has to be borne in mind, on the one hand, that historical testimony to matters of fact decreases rapidly in value as it recedes further from contemporaneous evidence, and, on the other, that even mere opinions as to such events as would go to increase the dignity and influence of any place, corporation, or person, have always a tendency to grow, to solidify, and to be put forward as ascertained facts by those chiefly concerned, without any deliberate intention to deceive, but from the natural working of interested bias.

In the Nicene era itself the only witness of importance is Eusebius († *circa* 338), and great as were his abilities, vast as was his learning, and unique as are his services to Christian literature, the fact remains that he is a singularly untrustworthy writer, who may be compared to Burnet for habitual and even wilful inaccuracy, and who therefore cannot, in face of the many errors which have been detected in his narrative, be accepted as conclusive upon any point resting on his unsupported statements. Such is the judgment of critics like Scaliger. What Eusebius has to tell us is:

(a.) 'That immediately under the reign of Claudius [*i.e.* A.D. 42], by the benign and gracious providence of God, Peter, that mighty and great Apostle, who by his courage took the lead of all the rest, was conducted to Rome against this pest of mankind [Simon Magus]. . . . So greatly did the splendour of piety enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers . . . that they persevered . . . to solicit Mark, as the companion of Peter, whose Gospel we have, that he should leave them a record in writing of the doctrine thus communicated by word of mouth. . . . This account is given by Clement in the sixth book of his *Institutions*,¹ whose testimony is corroborated also by that of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis. But Peter makes mention of Mark in the first Epistle, which he is also said to have composed at the same city of Rome, and that he shows this fact by calling that city, with an unusual figure of speech, Babylon.' —*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 14, 15.

¹ Ὑπομνημάτων, not extant.

(b.) 'The same author [Philo], in the reign of Claudius, is also said to have had familiar conversation with Peter at Rome, whilst he was preaching the Gospel to the inhabitants of that city. Nor is this at all improbable.'—*Hist. Ecl.* ii. 17.

(c.) 'Nero was led on in his rage to slaughter the Apostles: Paul is therefore said to have been beheaded at Rome, and Peter to have been crucified under him. And this account is confirmed by the fact that the names of Peter and Paul still remain in the cemeteries of that city even to this day.'—*Hist. Ecl.* ii. 25.

(d.) 'After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome.'—*Hist. Ecl.* iii. 2.

(e.) 'During this time [Trajan's reign] Clement was yet Bishop of the Romans, who was also the third that held the episcopate there after Paul and Peter, Linus being the first and Anacletus next in order.'—*Hist. Ecl.* iii. 21.

(f.) 'After Evaristus had completed the eighth year as Bishop of Rome, he was succeeded in the episcopate by Alexander, the sixth in succession from Peter and Paul.'—*Hist. Ecl.* iv. 1.

These six passages leave the episcopate of S. Peter as indeterminate as the ante-Nicene citations do. Their one support to the Ultramontane view is the statement that S. Peter was at Rome as early as the beginning (second year) of the reign of Claudius, which would no doubt give time for the five-and-twenty years' session at Rome afterwards ascribed to him. But Pagi, in his note on Baronius under A.D. 43, shows that this opinion of Eusebius contradicts the chronology of the Acts (according to which S. Peter remained in Judæa and Syria till after the death of Herod Agrippa I., in the *fourth* year of Claudius), the express statement of Lactantius that S. Peter did not arrive in Rome till Nero's reign, the date in the *Paschal Chronicle* (which declares that the Apostles did not break up their College at Jerusalem until after the Council there in the *sixth* year of Claudius), and the utter silence of ancient writers as to the double journey of S. Peter to Rome involved by it.

There remains, however, another testimony, going under the name of Eusebius, which is the real basis of the Ultramontane claim. In S. Jerome's Latin version of the *Chronicon* of that author, under the year 40, we read as follows: 'Peter the Apostle, after he had first founded the Church of Antioch, is sent to Rome, and preaching the Gospel there, he abode as Bishop for twenty-five years.' This agrees with the independent Armenian version, except that the latter gives *twenty* years, but when counted up there are twenty-seven. The Syriac epitome, however, gives twenty-five years. But the Greek of George Syncellus disagrees with the Latin in seve-

ral particulars, and runs thus: 'Peter, the chief, having first founded the Church at Antioch, departs to Rome, preaching the Gospel, and this same person, after being first of the Church at Antioch, presided also over that of Rome until his death.'

There are two or three things to be considered in estimating the value of these entries. First of all, that a chronicle, being intended as a book of frequent reference, is specially liable to alteration by copyists, who constantly add in matter which they think ought to be entered under the several years, and even bring the annals down to their own date; next, the discrepancies just cited; and, thirdly, the entire silence of Eusebius in his own more detailed history on the points here added, make it tolerably certain that we have here an interpolation of an unknown scribe at some unascertained, though doubtless early, date. And Pagi, following Baluze, both of them eminent Roman Catholic scholars, suggests that the notion of the twenty-five years' session of S. Peter arose from a hasty inference drawn from the passage of Lactantius above cited—where, however, these twenty-five years are counted from the first dispersion of all the Apostles on their missionary journeys until the reign of Nero, and have no special reference to S. Peter. In the genuine narrative of Eusebius it is to be noted that S. Paul's name twice precedes that of S. Peter, and their authority at Rome is said to be jointly exercised. And it is a curious fact, mentioned by Baronius and cited by Valesius in his notes to Eusebius, that on the most ancient seals of the Roman Church, whenever SS. Peter and Paul are engraved, the right hand, or place of honour, is given to S. Paul.

There is one obvious consideration, which has nevertheless been too little regarded in this controversy. It is that the scattered and as yet clearly unorganised and unofficered Christian assemblies in Rome, to which S. Paul wrote his Epistle, must, in all human probability, have mainly consisted of those very Jewish pilgrims—'strangers of Rome' (Acts ii. 10.)—who were converted by S. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost, and who would most naturally make a household word of the great Apostle's name, and regard him as in truth the founder of their faith and that of the little congregations of proselytes whom they gathered round them by their informal preaching when they returned, and all the more because no Apostolic teacher reached them for many years after. This memory would of course be quickened in the minds of the elder converts when the Apostle visited the city

at the close of his life, and his death amongst them would lead, by a most natural process, to their boasting that they were honoured above all other Churches by the presence of the two greatest Apostles, the heads of the Circumcision and of the Uncircumcision, both as being their founders, and as having won the crowns of martyrdom in their midst. This is quite enough to account for every one of the early references to S. Peter's share in the foundation of the Roman Church, even if a more exhaustive reason, to be stated presently, were not producible.

It is not till the post-Nicene era that the episcopate of S. Peter at Rome is clearly alleged as matter of fact, and the first to do so is Optatus of Milevi († after 386), who is a great deal more sure of the details than any of the writers of the three previous centuries. His words are: 'Thou canst not deny that thou knowest that in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was first bestowed (*collatam*) on Peter, wherein Peter, head of all the Apostles, sat. . . . Therefore Peter was the first to sit in that one chair, which is first in gifts, to whom succeeded Linus, Clement succeeded Linus, Anacletus, Clement.'—*De Schism. Donat.* ii. 2, 3.

But his younger contemporary, S. Epiphanius († 403), does not know the story in this form. In his statement the equality of the two Apostles is still affirmed, as in the earliest of the ante-Nicene writers, thus: 'In Rome Peter and Paul were also the first apostles and also bishops; then came Linus, then Cletus, then Clement, the contemporary of Peter and Paul, of whom Paul makes mention in his Epistle to the Romans. . . . However, the succession of the bishops in Rome was in the following order: Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clement, &c.' And, in contradiction to the assured certainty of Optatus, S. Epiphanius states expressly that we have no accurate knowledge (*οὐ πάνυ σαφὴς ἵσμεν*) as to the succession, since there is conflicting documentary evidence as to its order and origin.—(*Hær.* xxvii. 6.)

Rufinus of Aquileia († 410)—one of the most learned and famous scholars of his time—makes a further statement which is fatal, if correct, to the theory of inheritance from S. Peter. He says, in his preface to the *Clementine Recognitions*, 'Linus and Cletus were, in truth, bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, but in Peter's lifetime (*superstite Petro*), that is, they discharged the episcopal care, and he fulfilled the apostolic office.' This view, it is to be observed, denies implicitly that S. Peter, albeit resident at Rome, had any specific and local relation to its see (any more than S. Paul had to

Ephesus or Colosse), continuing to act in his general and delocalised apostolic capacity, while the two earliest Popes were not his successors, but merely his ordenees and contemporaries, bearing the same relation to him as Titus did to S. Paul, and of course not enjoying his privilege during his lifetime.

Another very important fact in this connexion is the date assigned to the pontificate of S. Linus by the very ancient Liberian and other catalogues of Roman bishops, by Anastasius the Librarian, and by the older Breviaries, which agree in stating that Linus sat in Nero's reign, from the consulate of Saturninus and Scipio (A.D. 56) till that of Capito and Rufus (A.D. 67), twelve years. Two lists of Popes, published by Mabillon (*De Re Diplomaticâ* and *Vetera Analecta*), severally assign to Linus a pontificate of eleven years three months and twelve days, and of twelve years five months and twelve days; while Eutychius of Alexandria says (*Ann. sect. 336*) that 'Linus was Patriarch of Rome after Peter, and died when he had held that dignity for twelve years; and he was the first Patriarch of Rome;' and the *Chronicle of Nicephorus* has the entry: 'Peter the Apostle, *two years*;¹ Linus, *twelve years*.' Here, then, is a consensus of authorities, according to some of which Linus was Pope of Rome during twelve years of S. Peter's life, for A.D. 67 is the most probable year of the Apostle's martyrdom. And hence, if these data could be fully relied on, it would be as nearly as possible proved to demonstration that S. Peter either never held the local see of Rome, or that he divested himself of it in favour of S. Linus. In the first case, the Papal claim of special heirship breaks down, and Rome merely stands on the footing of any other city where an Apostle nominated the first bishop; and, in the second case, it is clear that S. Linus, albeit Pope, never enjoyed the 'privilege of Peter,' in virtue of that office, so that the two things are separable and need not be united. It is noticeable, as previously remarked, that the *Apostolical Constitutions* represent S. Linus as predeceasing S. Peter. And though the *Chronicle* of Eusebius counts the twelve years of Linus from the death of S. Peter, in contradiction to the explicit consular date mentioned above, yet it will be noticed on examination that there is some mistake in the computation of the regnal years of the Emperors just at this place, which seriously weakens its value as testimony, seeming to point either to corruption of the

¹ Probably a mere scribe's error, ETHĒ for ETHĒB, as there is other Byzantine authority for twenty-two years' session.

text, or to carelessness on the author's own part. The least that can be said on a survey of the whole evidence, and of the many attempts made from the days of Pearson and Dodwell to Lipsius in our own time to clear up the chronological difficulty, is that a formidable gap exists here in the links of proof for the descent of the Petrine privilege, and that no means of adequately filling it up are known to exist.

It is S. Jerome († 420) who first collects into one body the scattered notices of S. Peter from Eusebius and elsewhere, and gives currency to the story of his twenty-five years' session at Rome, thus: 'Simon Peter . . . in the second year of the Emperor Claudius, went to Rome to overcome Simon Magus, and there occupied the sacerdotal chair for twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero.'—*De Viris Illustribus*, i.

No doubt this was the popular view at Rome in the time of Pope Damasus, and S. Jerome most probably got it from the archivists there. But that it represents a late and growing tradition appears not only from the reasons already mentioned for discrediting it, but from the still more remarkable fact that in the fifth chapter of this very book, devoted to an account of S. Paul, S. Jerome is entirely silent as to S. Paul's having had any share whatever in the foundation or the ecclesiastical government of the Church of Rome, contenting himself with mentioning the Apostle's imprisonments and martyrdom there. This shows that already there was a tendency at Rome to thrust S. Paul into the background, and so far to contradict, if not to falsify, the testimony of all the earlier records, including the New Testament itself. And so serious an omission in one part of the narrative justifies the belief that there has been as serious an accretion in the other part; even if the long distance of S. Jerome himself from the era he is here illustrating did not, by the unvarying laws of historical criticism, make his testimony of much less account than that of the numerous writers who preceded him, and knew nothing of this story, unheard of, so far as extant records permit us to say, for three centuries and a half after the date with which it concerns itself.

Later on, the assertions regarding S. Peter's session, pontificate, and supremacy come thick and fast, but of course have no evidential value whatever; and it must again be pointed out that nothing in the citations above, which practically contain the *whole* of the relevant extant testimony, is valid to prove, in the *legal* fashion required by Canon law for establishing a legal claim of privilege, the fact of S. Peter having ever been Bishop of Rome in any sense not equally

true of S. Paul, or having attached any specific grant or privilege to that see.

For (a) no trustworthy document, within six generations of S. Peter's death, is producible, plainly alleging him to have been Bishop of Rome in the received meaning of that phrase, or to have endowed that see in any special manner.

(b) The wording of such evidence as is actually tendered is obscure, doubtful, and contradictory.

(c.) A strict and literal construction of its matter leaves no ground available for even a primacy of honour, not to say a supremacy of jurisdiction.

But if the case be so in respect of S. Peter himself, much more does the evidence break down which is tendered on behalf of his successors. It should be enough, at the very outset, to allege, as barring every claim of the sort, two of the leading maxims of Canon law in questions of privilege, already stated, namely, that a privilege, if personal, follows the *person*, not the *office*, and dies with the person named in it; as, also, that a privilege may not be extended to any other person than the original grantee, because of identity or similarity of reason, unless such person be actually or constructively named in it.

Now, in the three Gospel texts on which the whole claim of privilege is avowedly rested as constituting the Petrine charter, the gifts and power bestowed, whatever they may have been, are personal and individual only in the form of grant: '*Thou art Peter . . . I will give to thee the keys . . . whatsoever thou shalt bind . . . I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not . . . and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren . . . Lovest thou Me? Feed [thou] My sheep . . . Follow thou Me;*'—and contain no clause whatsoever which can be construed into a right of transmission; whereas in the three other Scriptural charters of privilege, severally given to Abraham, as head of the children of promise; to Aaron, as high priest; and to David, as King of Israel, such transmission and devolution by hereditary descent is expressly named and provided for. S. Peter's charter may therefore be compared—let it be as comprehensive as possible in his own case—to a Crown patent conferring a great office of state, such as a viceroyalty or chief-justiceship, held at most for life; and the charters of Abraham, Aaron, and David, to patents of peerage transmissible to descendants. What S. Peter did not receive he could not give, and no document conferring on him the right to give is producible, or has even so much as been thought to have ever existed. Hence it is, as mentioned

already, that Tertullian actually denies that even the right of binding and loosing sins could be lawfully exercised by the Church, because the gift of binding and loosing had been bestowed on Peter *personally*, not upon the Church in general, and therefore must refer to those acts which are peculiar to Peter, and done by him once for all, such as his unlocking the doors of the heavenly kingdom by baptism, in which the loosing and binding of sins takes place, his binding Ananias and loosing the lame man, and his loosing and binding severally those parts of the Mosaic law which were to be repealed or retained—(*De Pudicitia*, xxi.) Of course the answer to Tertullian's argument is that the power of binding and loosing sins was bestowed not on Peter singly, but on all the Apostles—a fact he omits—but his reasoning as to those parts of the Petrine charter which are not paralleled in the Gospels is perfectly sound Canon law.

However, a rebutting plea may be entered to this effect. It is true that there is no power of devolution and transmission conferred on S. Peter by the express terms of his charter. But the Gospels are confessedly not exhaustive narratives, and we have no precise record of the many things which Christ taught the Apostles during the Great Forty Days, some of which, beyond all reasonable doubt, they carried out in such institutions as Confirmation, Ordination, and the like, which are also absent from the Gospels. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that an additional clause, empowering S. Peter to transmit his privilege, was amongst these supplementary revelations, and his testimony in the matter, as an inspired Apostle, would be as conclusive as the recorded words of Christ Himself.

Very good. But where is this testimony of S. Peter to be found? Not in the Acts of the Apostles, not in either of his own Epistles, not even by tradition in any one of the apocryphal writings ascribed to him. There is not so much as a presumable guess as to whether he ever made a grant of the kind verbally or in writing, much less as to the actual form of words or acts by which it was expressed. Once more, the first and fundamental maxim of Canon law bars the plea, for the document cannot be produced. If producible, it ought to contain, in clear and manifest terms, at least three clauses:—

(a.) A statement that not only had his restriction to the Church of the Circumcision been a mere temporary arrangement for private convenience, but that his own original charter had been subsequently enlarged by Christ, so as to enable him to transmit and bequeath it.

(b.) That he, in virtue of these fresh powers, attached the chief Apostolate, as distinguished from, and in addition to, the mere diocesan Episcopate, to the See of Rome, when taking his place there, to the exclusion of Jerusalem, Antioch, and all other cities and places in which he had exercised his functions, so barring any claims on their behalf.

(c.) That he constituted the Bishops of Rome his heirs and successors in the plenitude of his authority, giving them jurisdiction over all the Apostles who might survive him, and over all Churches founded by them throughout the world.

Less than this will not sustain the claims now made, nor in any degree satisfy the requirements of Canon law, but no jot of it has ever been even thought to exist.

Nor is the difficulty fully stated yet. Even were it possible to surmount this obstacle, another at once presents itself. An historical claim must prove every step, and much of the doctrine and usage of ancient Christendom is defended by some of the very earliest writers, such as S. Irenæus and Tertullian, by appeal to the traditions of the several Churches, and the carefully preserved records of the Episcopal succession from the Apostles. It might be assumed that in Rome, the greatest city and most important see of the ancient Church, and also a centre of learning in a lettered age, these records would be so accurately kept as to be models of precise notation and trustworthy evidence. But, in point of fact, there is great confusion and obscurity as to the order, names, and dates of the earliest Popes. The *eleven*, or rather *twelve*, following rival views have come down from remote antiquity:—

1. The Apostles, *in their lifetime*, made Linus Bishop of Rome, to whom Anacletus succeeded, and then Clement.—S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3.

2. Clement is already Bishop of Rome, and presumably ordained by S. Paul, *before* S. Peter goes thither.—*Apostolical Constitutions*, vi. 8.

3. Clement is ordained as Bishop of Rome by S. Peter soon before his own death.—*Clementine Homilies* and Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hæret.* 32.

4. Linus is first Bishop of Rome, *after the death* of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Anacletus second, and Clement third.—Eutychius Alexandr., Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 21.

5. Linus, first Bishop of Rome, is ordained by S. Paul: Clement, second Bishop, after the death of Linus, ordained by S. Peter.—*Apostolical Constitutions*, vii. 46.

6 and 6a. SS. Peter and Paul were jointly first Apostles and Bishops at Rome; then Linus, next Cletus, and then

Clement, it being uncertain whether Clement was ordained Bishop by the Apostles in the lifetime of Linus and Cletus, and kept in reserve without a see, to do occasional duty at Rome during the absence of the Apostles on missionary journeys, or ordained by S. Cletus after their deaths, there being historical statements both ways.—S. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæres.* xxvii. 6.

7. Linus and Cletus, first and second Bishops of Rome, predeceased S. Peter, himself never Bishop of Rome, but merely an Apostle residing there, who then ordained Clement in the third place.—Rufinus, *Pref. in Recogn. Clem.*

8. Linus was first Bishop, Clement second, and Cletus or Anacletus third, according to the current Latin opinion in S. Jerome's day, though S. Jerome himself makes Clement fourth in order.—S. Hieron. *De Viris Illustribus*, 15. S. August. *Epist.* liii. *ad Generosum*. Optat. Milev. *De Schism. Donat.* ii. 2.

9. Cletus and Anacletus (or Anencletus) are two distinct persons, so that the order is, Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Anacletus.—*Roman Breviary*.

10. Linus was elected by the people after S. Peter's death, and followed in order by Cletus, Anacletus, and Clement.—Anonymous author of the metrical *Five Books against Marcion*, bk. iii. (probably S. Victorinus of Pettau, † 303.¹)

11. Peter, Linus, Clement, Cletus, Anacletus.—*Liberian Catalogue*, A.D. 354.

In this catalogue, drawn up at Rome itself under the Pope whose name it bears, the consular date for the death of S. Linus fixes it in A.D. 67. The two lists in Eusebius (the *Chronicon* and the *Ecclesiastical History*) make it A.D. 79; and these three authorities severally fix the death of S. Clement in A.D. 76, 94, and 100.

Besides all this amount of irreconcilable variation, concentrated within the brief space of at most thirty-three years, there is yet another most weighty fact to be mentioned, which is that although the tradition runs that SS. Peter and Paul were martyred on the same day of the same month, yet there is said to have been an interval of a whole year between their deaths,² and S. Peter was the first to die.³ This circumstance is not mentioned very early, but it is in chief posses-

¹ Other opinions are that Victorinus of Marseilles or Victorinus Afer is the writer, but no certainty exists on the subject.

² Prudentius, *Peristeph.* xii. 5; S. August. *Serm.* xxviii.; Arator, ii. 12.

³ 'Prima Petrum rapuit sententia legibus Neronis.'—Prudent. *Perist.* xii. 11.

sion—there being less precise statement the other way,¹ and also bearing in mind that it is a detail extremely unlikely to be added later; whereas, the superior dramatic effectiveness of the simultaneous martyrdoms, celebrated as they are on the one day, most readily accounts for the omission of the interval between them, not for any purpose of fraud, but for greater picturesqueness and impressiveness in the narrative, if not indeed from simple mistake as to the matter of fact. Let us see what follows from these details, regarded legally, as to the matter of privilege.

First, then, the utter discrepancy of these eleven or twelve different accounts of the order of succession shows that no reliance whatever can be placed on the trustworthiness of the early Roman ecclesiastical records, from which S. Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Optatus, S. Jerome, S. Augustine, and the compilers of the Liberian Catalogue and of the original Roman Breviary, certainly; Rufinus, S. Epiphanius, and the compiler of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, most probably, obtained their information. If they could not settle such initial facts as to whether S. Peter is to be reckoned in, or left out of, the numerical account, whether S. Clement was first, second, third, or fourth in succession from S. Peter, whether Cletus and Anacletus are two persons or one, or whether S. Linus and S. Cletus entered on their office before or after S. Peter's death, it follows that the value of their evidence for S. Peter himself having ever been Bishop of Rome, or having appointed any one to succeed him in his chair and privileges, is reduced to a mere nothing; and yet no other testimony is offered us except this uncertain local tradition, accepted as true by writers at a distance from Rome, who either did not verify their statements by personal examination of the documents, or found contradictory entries (as indeed S. Epiphanius expressly says he did) if they did verify them. And the order which has the largest amount of evidence, such as it is, has not been followed by the Roman Missal and Breviary.

Next, this very carelessness establishes a second fact, that the question was not one of very great importance in the mind of the early Church. The exact details of the succession at Rome, however interesting locally, can have been thus of no greater practical significance to the Christian body at large than those of the order of the Bishops at Colosse

¹ It derives some slight confirmation from the prior mention of S. Peter's martyrdom by S. Clement (*Ep. ad Corinth.* i. 5), seeing that more stress is laid on that of S. Paul, and if so, that is the witness of a contemporary.

or Philippi. No stupendous powers, no unspeakably august inheritance, could have been thought to depend on the regularity and indefeasibility of the Roman claim by orderly succession. And this uncertainty is all the more remarkable when contrasted with the perfectly accurate knowledge we have of the civil chronology of this very time, with the order and succession of names of the Roman Consuls, albeit then mere titular dignitaries, of no greater importance than a modern high sheriff.

Thirdly, if Linus and Cletus were appointed as Bishops of Rome, and predeceased S. Peter, it is clear that he did not divest himself of his 'privilege' on their behalf, so that they were in that case Popes without enjoying any specific primacy in consequence—a conclusive proof that the privilege is not necessarily attached to the office. The same argument holds good if Linus was appointed Bishop during the lifetime of S. Peter, but survived him, because even in that case the Apostle must have separated the see from the privilege in his lifetime, and there is no proof that he provided for their reunion after his death. Again, if Linus was ordained by S. Paul—with whom alone the one brief New Testament reference (2 Tim. iv. 21) connects him—he was Pope of Rome without having any claim whatever through S. Peter.

Fourthly, if S. Peter did indeed consecrate any one of the three, Linus, Cletus, or Clement, as Bishop of Rome, or as intended to succeed himself in any capacity, that very fact is fatal to his title to have ever been bishop of the local see of Rome himself, for the ancient Church knew nothing of coadjutor bishops, nor of a bishop resigning his see to another, nor yet of ordaining any one with right of succession. Accordingly, Pope Innocent I. († 417), in a letter to the Church of Constantinople, lays down that it was an unheard-of thing, never done by any of the Fathers, to ordain any one to occupy the place of another still living, no one having had power given him for that purpose (*Soz. Hist. Eccl.* viii. 26). And indeed the Council of Antioch in 341 had decreed, in its twenty-third canon, thus: 'It is not lawful for a Bishop to appoint another as successor to himself, even if he be at the close of life; and if any such act be done, the appointment shall be void.' It is scarcely probable that such a rule would have been laid down if the Council knew of the august precedent set by the Prince of the Apostles in the chief city of the world. And it is not easy to see how the Council could have helped knowing it, supposing it to be a fact. A similar objection, by the bye, refutes that part of the story which

makes S. Peter to have been diocesan bishop of Antioch, and afterwards to have transferred his chair to Rome, for the Apostolical Canons, the General Councils of Nice and Chalcedon, the Synods of Antioch, Alexandria, Sardica, and Arles I., all severally condemn the migration and translation of bishops; and Popes Damasus and Leo the Great actually excommunicated all bishops who changed their sees, especially if to a greater and richer city.—(Theodoret, *H. E.* vii.; Leo Magn., *Epist.* lxxxiv. 4.)

Fifthly, if S. Paul survived S. Peter by a whole twelvemonth, and they two were joint founders and rulers of the Roman Church, in that case, by all maxims of official succession, the whole Apostolic authority there must have been then concentrated in S. Paul's hands, and only he could bequeath it, if it were transmissible at all. The question of the order in which two people, A and B, who are each other's nearest heirs-at-law, or who inherit under each other's wills, happen to die, is often of great importance in the passage of property. For though A and B may be heirs to each other, either by kindred or by testament, it does not follow that X, the next heir of A, must be also the next heir to B, either at law or under a will. B has another heir of his own, Y. Now, in such a case as this, if A die first, B inherits, and Y inherits in turn at B's death. But if B die first, A inherits, and X takes in turn from him, while Y gets nothing.¹ Apply this rule to

¹ Curious cases of this nature come occasionally before the law courts. It is the rule of French jurisprudence that where two or more persons die at the same time by accident, as by fire or drowning, the presumption is that the person whose age and physical condition seemed to promise the greatest power of escape or endurance must be held to have survived; while the English courts always rule that the deaths must be accounted simultaneous. A case of the sort (*re* Holden's Trusts) was decided by Vice-Chancellor Malins in May 1878. The captain of the ship *Great Queen-land* made his will in favour of his wife, and failing her, his daughter, and took them both to sea with him. The ship was lost, probably blown up by fire, and no tidings were ever heard of her. Hereupon a point of law arose. The executors could not tell who was next legatee, as that depended entirely on the order of the deaths. If the captain held out longest, his will failed by the deaths of his two legatees in his own lifetime, and he was practically intestate. If his wife survived her husband and child, then her family, to the exclusion of his relations, were the heirs. If the child lived longest, then her heirs, that is to say, the relations of both her father and her mother, were entitled to divide the estate. The court ruled that the deaths must be held to be simultaneous, and the legacies thus to have failed, so that only the captain's next heirs-at-law took anything, and those who claimed through the wife and child got nothing. A still more complicated case of the kind was decided by the House of Lords in 1860, that of *Wing v. Angrave*, arising out of the wreck of the *Dalhousie* in 1853. A husband and wife named Underwood,

the legal claim of privilege with which we are dealing. No Roman authority alleges any one of these three things: (a) that S. Paul was Pope, or inherited any Papal privileges from S. Peter, since he is not reckoned as Paul I., that Pope sitting from 757 to 767; (b) that any Pope inherited his primacy from or through S. Paul; (c) that S. Paul was subject to any other successor of S. Peter during the twelvemonth which elapsed between their martyrdoms. Nevertheless, one of these three events must, on Roman principles, have happened if S. Paul did survive S. Peter, and the next Pope, whoever he was, succeeded either before or after the death of S. Paul. Here, then, is a flaw in the whole case, which effectually negatives the evidence for the Petrine privilege of the Popes. On the other hand, if SS. Peter and Paul died on the very same day, the presumption is that S. Peter, who suffered the lingering death of crucifixion, survived S. Paul, beheaded as a Roman citizen, and of course inherited any joint rights from him; but this is just what the evidence contradicts.

There is only one even plausible solution of the difficulty as to the order of the early Papal succession, and even it does not get rid of all the contradictions just stated. It is that the same rule may have prevailed at Rome which we have some reason to believe was put in force by S. Peter and S. Paul at Antioch, and by S. Paul and S. John at Ephesus, namely, that the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians were at first organised as distinct Churches, under separate bishops, exercising simultaneous, yet independent, jurisdiction,¹ and were merged in the next generation—with the one exception of the Church of Jerusalem, which was ruled by Jewish bishops till Hadrian's time²—into one Church under the *Gentile* bishop. In this case it is most probable that S. Peter and S. Paul,

with three children, were swept away by the same wave, as attested by the only survivor of the wreck. They had left their property to their children, in the event of either dying in the other's lifetime, and in the event of those children all dying before reaching the age of twenty-one, to a Mr. Wing, as residuary legatee. He claimed under the two wills, but as there was no tittle of evidence as to which testator survived, it was held that Mr. Wing's claim was not made out, and that the deaths must be treated as simultaneous: so the estate went to their heirs-at-law, though no moral doubt was possible as to the truth of Wing's contention, that one of the two testators must have overlived the other, if by no more than an instant, and thus have produced the condition under which he claimed to inherit. These cases serve to illustrate the difference made in the transmission of an inheritance by the order of death amongst the transmitters.

¹ *Apost. Const.* vii. 46. Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* ii. 191.

² Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 6; v. 12.

keeping still to the divinely appointed division of their labour, presided over two separate communities at Rome, the one attached exclusively to the Circumcision and the other to the Gentiles, whilst the earliest names on the roll of Roman Bishops are those of contemporaneous, not successive, Pontiffs, but with this inevitable conclusion, that when the separate Jewish Church merged, the whole body must have come under the government of the Gentile Pope, whose succession necessarily came through S. Paul, since the only thing S. Peter without doubt enjoyed separately from S. Paul, and might therefore have handed down to a third person (Cletus, say, or any other), was his jurisdiction over the Jewish Church at Rome, which of course died out when there was no longer such a Church existing. And the Pauline language of the Epistle of S. Clement—whether he were the ‘fellow-worker’ named in Philippians iv. 3, of which no real proof is extant, or not—is weighty evidence, when coupled with the statement of *Apost. Const.* vi. 8, that his ordination was Pauline, rather than Petrine according to the competing traditions of S. Epiphanius and Rufinus, in which case he is the particular link in the Pauline succession. However, the manner in which he speaks of the martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Paul (laying, by the bye, very much more stress on the labours and eminence of the latter) implies that those events were comparatively distant at the date of his Letter to the Corinthians (*Ep.* i. cap. 5) although in the same generation, and thus seemingly disproves his own appointment by either of the Apostles to the see of Rome. But that the succession became exclusively Gentile very speedily admits of no question, and therefore the historical presumption is, that there is now no Petrine descent at all in the Roman chair, that line having died out within the first century: consequently no transmission of the Petrine privilege is so much as probable, even were the continued lack of the necessary legal proofs for establishing the claim waived as an objection. The opinion that there was a double episcopate at Rome in Apostolic times is not a modern one. Apart from the frequent mention of SS. Peter and Paul as jointly ruling there, the following notices are extant:—(a) In the ancient *Liber Pontificalis* or *Gesta Pontificum* it is said: ‘He [Peter] ordained two bishops, Linus and Cletus, that they might personally discharge all the priestly ministry for the people in the city of Rome, while Peter had leisure for prayer and for teaching the people in sermons.’ (b) S. Epiphanius says (*Hær.* xxvii. 6) that SS. Peter and Paul were first of all, at Rome, both Apostles and Bishops, and that

it was reasonable that they should appoint others in their lifetime, because it was necessary for themselves to go on missionary journeys, and yet Rome could not be left without a bishop. The context leaves it very doubtful whether S. Epiphanius thought Linus and Cletus to have held office simultaneously or successively. (c) Rufinus states that Linus and Cletus were consecrated by S. Peter in his own lifetime, to discharge the Episcopal office, while he filled the Apostolic one. (d) Venerable Bede (*Vit. Abb. Weremuth.*) says: 'The histories hand down that blessed Peter the Apostle appointed two bishops in order under him at Rome to govern the Church . . .' The objection to this view is that no duality of bishops there is certainly known till the time of the Novatian schism, and that the Novatians did not appeal to such a precedent, as they would most probably have done, if possible. Venerable Bede is the first to state plainly that S. Clement was ordained by S. Peter as his coadjutor with right of succession (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 40), but that was a comparatively late usage, unknown even in the fourth century; for the co-existence of two bishops in one see is as explicitly condemned by ancient usage as translation, or as nomination of his successor by any bishop, even coadjutorship being unknown (S. Cypr. *Ep.* 52; Theod. *H. E.* ii. 17), the first unquestioned instance being S. Augustine's coadjutorship with Valerius of Hippo in 395, and that, as he confesses, contrary to Canon law (S. August. *Ep.* 110, *al.* 213); and thus if the evidence of the Canons be against S. Peter's nomination of Linus, &c., it may be urged that it is equally valid against the joint episcopate of SS. Peter and Paul. The answer to this plea is the legal maxim, *Cessante ratione cessat ipsa lex*. There could be no valid reason for a double episcopate after the extinction of the Church of the Circumcision, but the convenience of such a plan while that Church still existed is obvious. Contrariwise, any objection which lies against translation and coadjutorship must have been always equally strong. And the proofs, given above, of the untrustworthiness of the Roman archives and traditions leave the silence of the Novatians but little weight as countervailing testimony.

And to the rejoinder that all this argument as to the failure of the Petrine succession is merely conjectural, the answer is, that so also is the argument for its continued existence: with this notable difference between the probability of the two rival theories, that the anti-Papal view has these three ascertained bases to go upon, that S. Peter was divinely restricted to the Church of the Circumcision, as S. Paul to

that of the Gentiles, that S. Clement's diction and theology are demonstrably Pauline, and that the simultaneous session of Linus and Cletus is at least implied by three ancient authorities; besides the further merit that this view does offer a coherent and reasonable explanation of the confused and contradictory lists of early Roman bishops; whereas the Ultramontane view is nothing but a mere guess without any ground, and gives up the problem of the conflicting lists as insoluble. Consequently, the rebutting plea is legally much the stronger, and it is a legal question, involving the exercise of the widest and most formidable legal rights, with which we have to deal.¹

ART. II.—THE WELLINGTON DESPATCHES AND GEORGE IV.

1. *Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field-Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington, K.G.* [In continuation of the former series.] Vols. I.—VII. 1819—1831. (London, 1878.)
2. *George Canning and his Times.* By A. G. STAPLETON. (London, 1831.)
3. *The Life and Administration of the Earl of Liverpool.* By C. D. YONGE. (London, 1868.)

THE seventh volume of the series of Despatches and Correspondence of the Duke of Wellington, which has been recently published, comes down to the death of George IV., and the dissolution of the Duke's administration a few months later, and, in so doing, presents a suitable opportunity for reviewing the events of that sovereign's reign, which, in the importance of its political transactions, laying, as they

¹ The practical effect on the Petrine claims of the difficulties above enumerated may be judged by considering how the House of Lords would have to decide on a double claim to an ancient peerage and to a great office of State alleged to be inseparable from it (as the High Stewardship of England once went with the Earldom of Leicester), if the claimant put in ten conflicting pedigrees as evidence, from which it could not be gathered which of three persons in the direct line of descent was grandfather, son, or grandson, and whether there had or had not been two or more of the earliest peers of the line who had never held the other dignity. There could be no result possible save rejection of the claim as not proved.

did, the foundation of new principles, and a new system of government, may, perhaps, equal any period of similar length in the history of our country since the Revolution.

It might have been expected that the fact that the Prince who, in January 1820, succeeded to the throne, had been already for some years exercising the royal authority in all its fulness, would have had a tendency to render his reign, at least at the outset, less eventful than others in which the change of sovereign might bring with it some change of policy. But there were circumstances in the condition of the kingdom, and of Europe in general, more than sufficient to negative this influence. The length and unexampled magnitude of the revolutionary war had not only kept every nation in Christendom in a state of feverish excitement, but had also produced a general disarrangement of the ordinary course of affairs. For a quarter of a century everything in every country had been kept in an unnatural condition, and, happy as was the cessation of the strain of universal war, the very relaxation of that strain must produce a reaction severely taxing the sagacity of the wisest statesmen to contend with and to regulate it.

In some respects England had suffered less than any other nation. The conqueror who had overrun all other countries had never approached our shores. Not one disaster by land or sea had tarnished our arms. The loss of life in our army and navy during the entire war fell short of that of our enemy in a single campaign. In the flowery metaphor of the great Irish orator, 'we had retired from the contest in a flame of glory,' diffusing not only a wide lustre, but a healthy warmth. Indeed, the vast increase of our military reputation, and the pre-eminent influence obtained in the councils of Europe, were substantial advantages which might reconcile statesmen capable of appreciating the true elements of national greatness to the efforts they had cost. But it could not be denied that the price had been large. We had been the paymasters of our allies, and had so augmented our national debt that its interest at the end of the war exceeded the entire revenue of the three kingdoms at its beginning. While the war lasted, the burden had been but slightly felt. The great and universal rise of prices which had taken place; the degree in which our mastery of the sea, and our immunity from invasion, had given us what was little short of a monopoly of trade and commerce, had enabled us to meet an expenditure which to the preceding generation would have appeared incredible. But, with the

war itself, the resources which had supported us through it, had also, to a great extent, passed away. Prices, which had been artificially raised, sank to their natural level. The manufactures and trade of other countries began to revive, and we lost the comparative monopoly that we had so long enjoyed. The inevitable result was that every industry began to feel the pressure of severe distress, and that distress produced almost equally general discontent. The ill-omened name of 'Radical' was invented to denote that those who assumed it desired to remodel the entire government from the *root* upwards. Riots broke out in different parts of the country, especially in the manufacturing districts. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended. In many places the troops were called out, and many lives were lost in conflicts between them and the mob, till, at last, matters grew so serious that a Committee of both Houses of Parliament was appointed to investigate them, which, after a protracted and careful investigation, affirmed the existence of an organised conspiracy to overturn the government and constitution of the country.

The spirit of disaffection which these disturbances displayed, was, indeed, confined to the lowest class of the people. But the conviction of the necessity of a certain amount of change was felt by men of a different order, by many influential statesmen in both Houses of Parliament, and, on one point, was even shared by a considerable section of the Cabinet. Indeed, on the most important subjects, it may be said to have been a legacy from the most illustrious of their predecessors. Pitt himself had led the way towards freedom of trade; he had planned a large measure of Parliamentary reform, which nothing but the excitement created by the French Revolution had caused him eventually to relinquish; and he had sacrificed his post of Prime Minister to his desire to remove the political restrictions on Dissenters which had been imposed in the reign of Charles II. It was almost inevitable that the restoration of peace should revive the discussion of these subjects, which were such that, when once mooted, a settlement of them by some degree of concession was inevitable. Taken altogether, the state of the kingdom was such as to cause more than ordinary anxiety to the Ministry, which, under the skilful guidance of Lord Liverpool, had conducted its affairs for the last eight years; while it was greatly to be feared that the mere fact of the accession of the new sovereign would aggravate it by fresh difficulties of, in some respects, a yet more embarrassing, because a more discreditable nature.

The first weeks of the new reign were marked by an

accumulation of troubles. The old King had not yet been laid in the grave when his successor was attacked by an inflammation of the lungs, which for some days placed his life in imminent danger. And scarcely had his illness yielded to the skill of his physicians when the nation was still more painfully excited by the discovery of a conspiracy unexampled since the days of the Gunpowder Plot for the extent of the destruction and bloodshed which it contemplated. A man named Thistlewood had visited Paris in the days of the Revolution, and had there become infected with the Jacobin and infidel doctrines of the time and place, which, though he subsequently obtained a commission in the army, he had never renounced. He had recently been imprisoned for taking part in some of the riotous and seditious proceedings above mentioned; and, on the expiration of his sentence, in the autumn of 1819, he had gathered round him a gang of desperadoes, and had formed a plan to murder the whole body of Ministers, to set London on fire, and to establish a republic. The day for the execution of the plot was February 23; but, from the very first organisation of the conspiracy, its every step had been betrayed to the Home Secretary, Lord Sidmouth, and on the appointed evening, just as the conspirators were leaving their place of meeting to carry it out, they were surrounded by a body of constables and soldiers, and the greater part of them were apprehended. Thistlewood himself, with some of the most guilty of his accomplices, was executed, several others were transported, and the whole conspiracy was effectually extinguished.

The horror excited by a plot of such unexampled atrocity would ordinarily have strengthened the Government by proving that not it alone, but all constituted authority, all law, religion, and humanity, were alike attacked by the so-called leaders of the people. But, even before this conspiracy burst, a fresh trouble befell the Government, one which weakened it through engendering unfriendly feelings on the part of the King towards all his Ministers, and was the more difficult to deal with because arising, as has been intimated before, partly out of the fact of the King's accession to the throne, and partly out of his own conduct in a case in which it was notoriously indefensible.

No one would dwell needlessly on a bygone scandal, which not only disgraced the parties principally concerned, the sovereigns themselves, but which reflected some degree of discredit on the whole nation. Suffice it to say that, in the first instance at least, the lady was more sinned against than sin-

ning. In 1795 the King, then Prince of Wales, had married his cousin, the Princess Caroline of Brunswick ; but, nearly as they were related, they had never previously met, nor did he profess any affection for her, or any other motive for the marriage than a desire to obtain his father's consent to the payment of his debts. Such love as he was capable of, indeed, he had already bestowed on another lady, to whom, though a subject and a Roman Catholic, he was secretly married. But neither his clandestine nor his avowed marriage restrained his conduct. To the Princess he never behaved with decency for a single day. Even on his first introduction to her his demeanour was uncourteous and coarse.¹ Very shortly after the marriage he formally separated himself from her ; and from that day forth he heaped upon her every indignity and injury which malice could devise. He compelled her to receive one of his mistresses as her Lady of the Bedchamber. He called in question her fidelity to her marriage vows ; and, though she was acquitted of the charge by a committee appointed to investigate it, he sought to induce his father to exclude her from Court. He placed severe restrictions on her intercourse with their only child ; and when, after the downfall of Napoleon, some of the foreign sovereigns visited London, he (being now Regent of the kingdom) selected that moment of general triumph and exultation to make his insults more conspicuous than ever. As if his object had been to parade his enmity towards her before all Europe, he compelled her absence from the Queen's drawing-room, and he prevented his royal guests from paying her the ordinary compliment of a visit.

Worn out at last with ceaseless persecution, the Princess procured his consent to quit England, and to live abroad for the future. It was a natural, but most unfortunate resolution on her part. She resided chiefly in the North of Italy, where she gradually learnt to neglect the caution she had observed in England. After a year or two reports arose of her intimacy with a servant, whom she had raised from a menial situation to that of the chief officer of her household, and whom she admitted to a familiar intercourse quite incompatible with innocence. The Regent sent agents into Italy to inquire into the truth of the rumours that had reached him, and their report so fully confirmed them that, in the summer of 1819, while his father was still alive, he laid it before Lord Liver-

¹ See Lord Malmesbury's account of their first interview.—*Lord Malmesbury's Diaries*, iii. 218.

pool and his colleagues, with a demand that they should at once take steps to enable him to procure a divorce.

It was a most embarrassing demand. To everyone but himself it was plain that his own conduct had placed insuperable obstacles in the way of gratifying it; and they besought him to abandon the design, though they could not conceal from themselves the certainty that, when he should become King, the question would be revived under a somewhat different aspect. Their forebodings were justified. Even before George III. was laid in his grave, he renewed his demand, while the lady, now become Queen, made a counter demand to have her rank formally recognised by the introduction of a prayer for her into the Liturgy, coupling it with an announcement of her intention at once to return to England to assert her rights in person if this request were not granted. The rule of mentioning Queens Consort in the prayers had, however, not been invariable, and it did not seem impossible to devise a compromise. The Queen's ostensible adviser was Mr. Brougham, a barrister of considerable reputation, and enjoying a high reputation for eloquence as a speaker in the House of Commons. And he expressed himself fully inclined to co-operate with the Ministers in framing an agreement which, while it saved his client's honour by involving no mention of the imputations against her, should at the same time protect the King and the country from the inconveniences which her presence could not fail to cause. Unluckily he was not her only nor her most trusted councillor. Her confidence was given in a far higher degree to Mr. Wood, a London linendraper, who had been Lord Mayor. Some of the letters which she addressed to him are extant, oddly made up of orders for new dresses and compliments on his sagacity and deserved popularity. And, when he learnt that she had left Italy on her journey northward, he crossed the Channel to meet her. Mr. Brougham, who had done the same thing, reached St. Omer at the same time with the alderman, but only to find all his counsels and entreaties disregarded. On the afternoon of June 3, having sent her Italian servants back to their own country (it was her only act of common sense), she drove off to Calais, accompanied by Mr. Wood, and Mr. Brougham was left to comfort himself as he might by such sarcasms on the capacity of his rival in her favour as were implied in giving him the nickname of Thistle-Wood.

The Rubicon was passed. She proceeded to London, and her reception in the different towns through which she travelled was such as to lead her for a moment to believe

that she had judged well in coming to England. The people had a conviction that she had been very ill-treated, which they desired to express with a sympathy which was strangely indiscriminating. Sixteen or seventeen years before, while living at Blackheath, she had adopted a poor child named William Austin, and lavished on him such fondness that a report arose that he was her own son. The rumour, indeed, had been the chief ground for her husband's demanding the investigation into her conduct; but the commissioners had been satisfied that it was unfounded. Now, however, among the cheers which greeted her, many were raised in honour of 'William Austin, the Queen's son,' the shouters never reflecting that, if he were such, no other justification for the proceedings against her could be needed.

But on her arrival in the capital she was sadly undeceived. It was the one contingency which, in Lord Liverpool's view, made it his duty, as the lesser of two great evils, to endeavour to promote the King's object of dissolving his marriage. Should she remain in England as Queen, in outward appearance unimpeachable, because unimpeached, she must of necessity preside over the Court, and hold drawing-rooms, a scandal which would tend to bring the monarchy itself into disrepute. And accordingly a royal message was instantly sent down to both Houses of Parliament to direct their attention to her conduct during her residence on the Continent. From that moment the subject engrossed the attention not only of the Parliament, but of the whole kingdom. It was a singular instance of the working of our Parliamentary Constitution that it was made a party question. The Whigs had never forgotten their disappointment at the Prince's desertion of them when he became Regent, and at his retention of the Tory Ministry on Mr. Percival's death; and the present crisis seemed to offer them an opportunity of at once revenging themselves on him, and driving their rivals from office. Circumstances were unusually favourable to them. They were much stronger in the present than they had been in the last Parliament. The treatment of the Queen was not the only question on which the King was at variance with the Ministry. He had been almost equally offended at their refusal so to arrange the Civil List as to place at his private disposal a far larger sum than any previous sovereign had ever enjoyed; a measure which, considering the general distress, Lord Liverpool represented to him to be wholly inconsistent with his duty. And the indelicate openness with which he had expressed his displeasure had led to a general belief that he

intended to entrust the Government to other councillors, which had cost the Ministry many seats at the general election following the decease of George III. The policy of the whole reign was often largely coloured, and greatly to the King's discomfort, by the change in the Parliamentary strength of parties thus resulting from his own petulant and undignified want of self-command.

The Whigs, therefore, as a body now took up the cause of the Queen. A few days were wasted in fruitless endeavours to avert the necessity for any public proceeding. Wilberforce, whose singularly pure character qualified him above all other men for the office of mediator in such a case, carried through the House of Commons an address entreating the Queen to accept proposals from the Ministers which her own legal advisers recognised as sufficiently favourable. But neither was he a counsellor to whom the misguided lady was inclined to listen, if indeed she listened to any. In fact, neither she nor the King desired a compromise; for they had worked themselves up to a pitch of hatred which made them equally shameless and indifferent to the exposure of a public enquiry. The whole transaction is perhaps chiefly important to the historian from the light which it throws upon the character of George IV.; on the malice and rancour of which he was capable; and on the difficulties which beset any Minister in dealing with such a master. He even declared that 'the interest of the nation' was his sole object. And, in reply to the hints which Lord Liverpool ventured to let fall of the scandal which must ensue if the Queen should attempt re-creation, he, with a somewhat comical air of self-devotion to the welfare of his people, avowed his willingness to 'endure all the discomfort to which he could be exposed;' while she thought more of revenge on him than of her own fame, and openly threatened to 'blow him off his throne.'

Accordingly she rejected alike the proposals of the Government and the entreaties of the Parliament, replying to them by the presentation of a petition to the House of Lords, in which she challenged 'a complete and immediate investigation of all her conduct.' Some delay was inevitable from the necessity of giving time to procure the attendance of witnesses, of whom the majority were in Italy. But by the middle of August the desired evidence was procured, and the enquiry commenced. Then and ever since it has been known by the name of the Queen's Trial. But it was not so much a judicial as a legislative proceeding; the form adopted being that of a Bill of Pains and Penalties to deprive her of her

rank and privileges as Queen on the ground of specified misconduct. With a few unavoidable interruptions it was continued for nearly three months to the grief and shame of all right-minded people here, and to the amazement of foreign nations. Out of doors the mob took the part of the lady. Ministers were hooted in the streets: they were even assailed with anonymous letters threatening their lives. Her own sex, too, was generally on the same side, from sympathy, and indignation at the treatment which she had received from her husband before she could possibly have given him the slightest provocation. In the House of Lords, in spite of overwhelming proof of her misconduct, the Whigs adhered to her to the end; several of them, and especially their leaders, Lord Grey and Lord Holland, attacking the Government with a coarse intemperance which gave Lord Liverpool easy victories. Of all those concerned or implicated in the business, the Prime Minister¹ and the counsel on each side were the only persons who reaped anything but discredit from it. As no case of equal importance had ever been brought before the House, so, it was universally admitted, none had ever been argued with such an abundance of legal knowledge, such acuteness in sifting evidence and eliciting truth, or such a wealth of eloquence. But the case against the Queen was irresistible; and in November a majority of 28 voted for the second reading of the Bill, a vote which was tantamount to a verdict that the charges had been proved. The number, however, of those who were willing to dissolve her marriage was so much smaller, the majority for the third reading dwindling to 9, that Lord Liverpool preferred withdrawing the Bill to sending it down to the Commons, where its chances of success were slender, if not hopeless.

In spite, however, of the undeniable purport of the vote for the second reading, the Queen and her partisans treated the abandonment of the Bill as an acquittal and a triumph. London, Edinburgh, Dublin, with other towns, were illuminated. The Common Council of London, corporations of many provincial towns, and other bodies, regular or self-constituted, presented addresses of congratulation. As one of the squibs of the day, taking its title from the suggestive

¹ Lord Liverpool, having the conduct of the Bill in the House, discharged his painful duty with an unflinching patience, judgment, and good taste, as well as with a thorough appreciation of legal points and arguments which extorted the praises of the most experienced lawyers in the House.—Mr. Burton's Letter to Lord Colchester, who was in Italy, date November 15. *Diaries of Lord Colchester*, iii. 180.

name of the Queen's Chamberlain, Mr. Hare, expressed it—

All sorts of addresses
From collars of S's
To vendors of cresses
Flocked in like a fair,
And all through September,
October, November,
All down to December,
They hunted this hare.

And the Queen took, or pretended to take, these somewhat grotesque exhibitions as the unanimous voice of the nation. She replied to some of them in language which, if not treasonable, fell certainly little short of sedition.¹ She instantly demanded that a royal palace should be assigned to her for a residence, and she announced her intention of going in state to St. Paul's to return thanks for her deliverance from the malice of her enemies. But, though a few horsemen who formed the immediate escort of her carriage, were of the grade of gentlemen, the bulk of the procession was a mere rabble. And she had the mortification of seeing that, after the first excitement, her popularity, even with the mob, had begun to die away. However, she still maintained a bold front; she refused to accept the annuity which the Ministers induced the Parliament to settle on her, till her title should be inserted in the Liturgy; and, after she retracted that refusal, she announced her intention of attending the King's first drawing-room, to present him a petition on the subject. The King, as she must have expected, refused to receive her. As the Coronation was fixed for July, she next demanded to be crowned, writing a letter to the King himself, to ask him to 'command ladies of the first rank to attend her,' and, with what was probably meant as a satirical allusion to his fondness for dress, 'most earnestly entreating him to inform her in what dress he wished her to appear.' And when that, too, was refused, on the appointed morning she drove down to the Abbey, and endeavoured to obtain admission as a spectator. But she was compelled to retire; and, if she had hoped to produce a demonstration of the populace in her favour, she was disappointed. In the spring the House of Commons, in which she believed herself still to have many friends, or at least advocates, had approved the conduct of the Ministers

¹ Lord Liverpool, no user of exaggerated language, in a letter to Wilberforce, November 29, 1820, does not scruple to speak of 'her treasonable and seditious answers to many of the addresses.'—*Life*, iii. 113.

towards her by the largest majority which they had obtained for some years; and now she saw that the people out of doors had ceased to take any interest in her fortunes. The year before two members of the Cabinet had ventured on predictions respecting her and her husband. While she was still in Italy Lord Eldon prophesied that, if she came, she would be the idol of the multitude for a short time; but in a few months would be ruined in the opinion of all men. When the trial ended, Lord Londonderry made the still bolder prediction that in six months the King would be the most popular man in his dominions. She now saw that it was so; that she had been fatally ill-advised; and the discovery broke her heart. A few days after the coronation she was struck down by a fever, which, aggravated by mental vexation, proved fatal, and in the first week of August she died.

A few weeks earlier an expression, into which her husband was surprised, had shown the feeling with which he still regarded her. One morning in June the lord in waiting greeted him with, 'I bring your Majesty news of the death of your greatest enemy.' 'Is she dead?' was the reply. The speaker referred to Napoleon, who had expired at St. Helena in the preceding May. And the feeling which the King had shown while she lived, he clung to even after her death. He did indeed permit the execution of her wish to be carried to Brunswick for burial among her own people, which obviated the difficulties inseparable from a funeral in England. But he positively rejected Lord Liverpool's advice, not to say entreaty, to order the customary general mourning, and would only consent to an unusually short Court mourning, though he did himself put on the crape and black garments of a widower.

Lord Londonderry had predicted that he would shortly become popular; and it seemed as if he desired to test the accuracy of the prophecy in the prophet's own country, by visiting Ireland. Perhaps he thought that the novelty of the compliment would make it acceptable; for since James and William had made Ireland their battle-field, no English king had crossed St. George's Channel, and only one, the unfortunate Richard II., in the long roll of their predecessors. If so, he was not deceived. No monarch that ever sat on a throne was ever endowed with greater grace and dignity of manner; and, if the language in which he expressed to the citizens of Dublin his delight at finding himself among them was a little exaggerated, it was not the less suited to the humour of those to whom it was addressed. Even those who for twenty years had been the most persevering and bitter in their opposition

to every English Ministry, now put themselves forward as spokesmen at the different meetings assembled to organise the reception of, and to frame addresses to, the sovereign who was honouring their country by his first visit; and if the compliments which they paid him provoked the satirical scorn of the great Whig poet, they probably represented with but little exaggeration the momentary feelings of the Irish people, whose unreflecting impulsiveness and changeable humour are really one of the chief obstacles to their steady government. For the moment the shoeless peasant who paid his Majesty's turnpike out of his own pocket, that it might never be said that the King had come to Ireland, and could not find a single man to pay a toll for him, faithfully represented the feelings of his countrymen in general, whatever he or they might think the next month, when the recollection of the monarch's noble presence and gracious manner had passed away.¹ Some of his acts were less calculated to please even the most unreflecting of the population. He visited only one of the Irish nobles at his own house, and him the husband of the lady so unenviably notorious as occupying a position which was one of the chief obstacles to his obtaining the divorce for which he had been so solicitous.

His Majesty did not confine his travels this year to Ireland; but, as if he had been desirous of marking as strongly as possible the difference between himself and his father, whose journeys during his whole reign never extended beyond Devonshire in one direction, and Warwickshire in another, after his return from Dublin he crossed over to the Continent to his Hanoverian dominions. He took Belgium on his way, having invited the Duke of Wellington to accompany

¹ The King's speech on reaching the Viceregal Lodge in the Phoenix Park was, 'This is one of the happiest days of my life. I have long wished to visit you. My heart has always been Irish: from the day it first beat I have loved Ireland, and this day has shown me that I am beloved by my Irish subjects. Rank, station, honours are nothing; but to feel that I live in the hearts of my Irish subjects is to me exalted happiness. Go and do by me as I shall do by you: drink my health in a bumper: I shall drink yours in a bumper of good Irish whisky.' To his English subjects it probably seemed as if his Majesty had taken Blarney on his road to Dublin; but Byron's indignation was raised not so much at the King's compliments to the Irish, as at their paying them back with corresponding fulsomeness—

'Wear, Fingal, his trappings, O'Connell proclaim
His accomplishments! *His!!* and thy country convince
Half an age's abuse was an error of fame,
And that Hal is the rascalliest, sweetest young Prince.'

The Irish Avatar, st. 17.

him so far, that he might act as his guide over the field of Waterloo; but the Duke was rather amused than gratified to find that, though his Majesty asked him a number of the ordinary questions about the battle, which he answered as faithfully as Ulysses explained the siege of Troy to Calypso, the only incident that seemed to make a strong impression on the royal mind was the loss of Lord Anglesey's leg.

Meanwhile the conduct of the Government during the year 1821, far from being rendered easier to the Ministry by the termination of the Queen's Trial, had become more difficult than ever through its making the King fancy himself more independent of them, and in a position to find it easier to get rid of the whole party. And he made so little concealment of his inclination, that the Duke of Wellington, who, as Master-General of the Ordnance, had lately become a member of the Cabinet, remonstrated strongly with him on the subject, insisting not only on its impolicy with respect to his own personal interests, since many questions relating to the Queen and to the late investigation would necessarily come under discussion in Parliament, but on what he did not scruple to call its 'great unfairness'¹ towards his Ministers, whom he was bound to support through the expected debates.

Throughout this reign (it may be said in some respects also through those which followed it), the Duke of Wellington stood in a somewhat peculiar position. As the greatest of all the warriors concerned in the confederacy against Napoleon, he had rendered services to his country and to Europe in general which necessarily gave him great weight with all classes and parties. Those who believed themselves best acquainted with the King's secret feelings, doubted whether his Majesty regarded him with the cordial good-will which he professed. He seemed to them rather to stand in awe of him; while the Duke, on his part, though never forgetting the deferential manner due to his sovereign, often volunteered advice, and even remonstrance, in the tone of an equal. Indeed, at the outset of his Ministerial life, the Duke had such confidence in his own practical wisdom, that he was rather fond of giving advice to his colleagues also, even in matters wholly outside of his own department. But, to the credit of both it must be said, he never seems to have volunteered counsel to the Prime Minister, but, on the contrary, at all times to have concurred with and supported him with the most undeviating loyalty.²

¹ *Wellington Despatches*, i. 151.

² e.g., see *Wellington Despatches*, ii. 315.

And his steadiness on this point was the more important, because Lord Liverpool himself was the member of the Cabinet whom the King at this time regarded with the most personal displeasure. He had considered him the sole obstacle to his obtaining the increase of revenue which he demanded. To him was also due the resolution of the Cabinet not to send the Bill against the Queen down to the House of Commons, which the King had received with extreme ill-humour. And he had since given his Majesty almost equal offence by withstanding him in a matter in which, as he chose to represent it, not only his personal feelings, but even his personal honour was concerned.

There was no part of his duty which Lord Liverpool discharged with more scrupulous conscientiousness than that which related to the disposal of the Church patronage of the Crown. On no subject did he feel his responsibility more deeply, or, so feeling, was less inclined to admit of any improper interference. George IV., however, was in the habit of talking, and sometimes even of making promises, as if the conferring of Church appointments were a part of his prerogative, and in the spring of 1821 he sent for a young clergyman who had been tutor to the eldest son of Lord Conyngham, and announced to him his intention of appointing him to a canonry of Windsor, which had just become vacant. The influence that had persuaded him thus to act could be no secret, and that the distribution of dignities in the Church should be so directed Lord Liverpool regarded as intolerable. As it was by letter that the King communicated to him what he had done, he replied in writing, pointing out in the most respectful language, but with uncompromising firmness, that he could not reconcile it with his own 'public duty' and 'official responsibility' 'to conform to his Majesty's wishes' in this instance. The clergyman whom the King thus desired to promote was very young, and as yet had never held even the smallest living; while canonries of Windsor were among the most honourable prizes in the Church. To confer this one as his Majesty proposed would excite general umbrage, and be 'most injurious to his Majesty's interests,' though Lord Liverpool at the same time professed himself willing hereafter to promote the further prospects of the gentleman in question in some less objectionable way.¹

The King was angry beyond measure. He charged Lord Liverpool with making a most ungrateful return for the sup-

¹ *Life of Lord Liverpool*, iii. 151.

port which, 'often at the sacrifice of the most painful personal feeling and opinions,' he had uniformly given to his administration. He affirmed that his own 'good faith and honour' were at stake; and that he 'saw no reason to alter his determination on the subject,' since 'it was no longer a question of the prosperity of this little appointment,' but 'whether the King's word was to be held sacred or of no avail.' He even condescended to assert that 'the appointment had been given by himself alone,' unsolicited by any 'private friend,' an assertion which he could hardly expect to be accepted with implicit belief and which did not shake Lord Liverpool's resolution, who replied that in this, as in all similar¹ cases, any

'expectation which might have been personally held out by the sovereign was subject to the responsibility of his Minister, and that it must be a sufficient answer on such an occasion that the appointment had been obstructed in a quarter which could not, by the laws of the country, be passed by.'

And this was so clearly the theory of the Constitution that the King was forced to yield; though he did so with an unusually bad grace, and long cherished a deep resentment against the Minister who had thus thwarted him.

The way which he took of showing it was singular enough. As he was fully aware that the country would not accept a change of the Ministry, it might have been thought that his own comfort would have led him to desire that it should be as strong as possible. But he now proposed to punish Lord Liverpool by obstructing his efforts to make it so. It was not so strong as it had been at his accession. It had sustained

¹ From the *Life of Lord Eldon*, we learn that a somewhat similar case, involving a still more important appointment, had occurred in the previous year. The See of Winchester having become vacant, Lord Liverpool bestowed it on the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Tomline, formerly the tutor of his own old friend and political tutor, Pitt, and distinguished as the author of some theological works which still enjoy a high reputation: but it was understood that the King had repeatedly promised it to the Bishop of Exeter, who made no secret of his disappointment. The Lord Chancellor's comment on the transaction is, that in such matters 'Kings have, in fact, less will of their own than any of their subjects have, and they are ill-used when they are reproached for breach of promise. For, in the nature of the thing, their promises can mean no more than that they will express a wish about the matter to the Minister for the time being'—(ii. 381.) On that occasion, however, as there was no lady in the case, the King does not appear to have minded being overruled. And it happened somewhat singularly, that this very promotion of Dr. Tomline to Winchester eventually enabled him to make magnificent amends for his disappointment to the young clergyman for whom he had failed to obtain his canonry.

one serious loss, and was threatened with two more. Mr. Canning, who at the death of George III., was President of the Board of Control, was a statesman of long parliamentary and official experience, of the most enlightened views, and as an orator,¹ ever since the death of Pitt, had been altogether without a rival in either House of Parliament. He was also in a special degree the personal friend of the Prime Minister, to whom he had been warmly attached ever since they had been undergraduates at Oxford. But in the early part of the century he had been so much consulted by the Queen, then Princess of Wales, that he felt himself precluded in honour from taking any share in the proceedings against her, and, after the abandonment of the Bill, he thought it fairer to his colleagues to resign office, than to sit silent when the case was discussed, and their conduct attacked.

But his loss had been severely felt, and, as soon as the Queen had ceased to be a subject of party debate, Lord Liverpool felt that the cause of his retirement had also passed away. He needed his aid the more because Lord Sidmouth, who had been Home Secretary from the first formation of his Ministry, had announced that his age and failing health compelled him to resign; the Chancellor, Lord Eldon, after twenty years of office, was also desirous to retire, while the complexion of affairs, both at home and abroad, required not only the most cautious, but the most large-minded handling. At home, the long proved corruption of the Cornish borough of Grampound had furnished a plea for re-opening the question of Parliamentary reform which had slumbered for above thirty years, and for advancing a step towards its accomplishment, by proposing to transfer the seats to be taken from Grampound, on the disfranchisement of which all parties were agreed, to Leeds, which, with many other populous towns, was still unrepresented. But not only was Lord Liverpool opposed in principle² to 'giving the right of election to the populous manufacturing towns,' but he was convinced that 'the most respectable inhabitants of such towns agreed with him,' arguing from the marked indifference on the subject, which the most populous of all, Manchester and Birmingham, had displayed, when Pitt had proposed to enfranchise them at the beginning of his administration. He therefore preferred transferring the vacant seats to Yorkshire,

¹ 'Our last, our best, our only orator,
E'en I can praise thee, Tories can no more.'

Byron, *Age of Bronze*, xiii.

² See his Memorandum on the subject. *Life*, iii. 137.

and easily carried his colleagues and the Parliament with him: but it was plain that the subject would recur, and, as Canning coincided with him on every point, he naturally desired to have him by his side in the next discussion of what he foresaw was destined to be one of the most stirring questions of the future. Another object which he had greatly at heart, and on which also Canning wholly agreed with him, was the relaxation of the rigorous system of protection which had hitherto been the rule of English financiers, and the gradual introduction of a freer system of trade.

The affairs of the Continent, too, were, perhaps, even more laden with anxiety for a Minister resolute to maintain both the pre-eminence of England, and, if possible, the peace of Europe. East and West and South, in Turkey, in Spain, and in Italy, clouds were arising. The two congresses of Troppau and Laybach had not, in the eyes of the Prime Minister, diminished the danger of war. Another congress might become necessary, and both he and the Foreign Secretary, Lord Castlereagh, long cordially reconciled to his old rival, were eagerly desirous to have the benefit of Canning's support in the Cabinet, when such matters should come under discussion.

The return of Canning to the Ministry was not, however, the only additional support which Lord Liverpool desired to obtain. It was somewhat of a satire on our system of Parliamentary government before the Reform Bill that borough influence, at times, enabled wealthy nobles to obtain advantages for themselves, or their connections, to which no talent or personal merit gave them the slightest claim. In the last reign this had been strikingly exemplified in the case of the Duke of Portland, and now the Marquis of Buckingham conceived himself to be in a position to make a similar profit of the weight which his property gave him in his native county. His uncle, Lord Grenville, was the only member of his family whose abilities could have made his accession of the slightest importance; and, though they were considerable, they were, in some degree, counterbalanced by his arrogance and impracticability. But he was also the only one who did not wish for office. The Marquis himself, though possessed of no talent, natural or acquired, was eager for anything, for the Governor-Generalship of India, for the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, for a seat in the Cabinet, with or without any first-rate office, and, above all, for a dukedom. And he had connections and dependents, whose appetite for place was almost equally omnivorous, and whose capacity to fill any, equally slender. His calculations were so far correct that

Lord Liverpool did conceive his support of importance, though he would have esteemed it less had he been aware that the party was at the same moment trying to open a negotiation with the Whigs. Accordingly, he decided on including some of the Marquis's friends in his new arrangements; but on proposing them to his Majesty, the King at once placed his absolute veto on Canning. He had taken deep offence at language which some of those whom he regarded as Canning's followers had used respecting the proceedings of the Queen, and declared that he had made such a vow never again to admit him into his service, that, 'as a gentleman,' he could not break it, though to some even of Lord Liverpool's colleagues he avowed that his real object was to punish the Prime Minister, since Canning was his especial friend. Lord Liverpool was not inclined to give way. He saw through the King's motives; knowing that he was coquetting with the Opposition, and was learning from them to consider his truest policy for his personal objects to be 'not to strengthen his Ministry, lest he should put it out of his own power to change them.'¹ As Lord Liverpool explained to one in his confidence, he was 'not contending for a single isolated point.' The only objection to Canning must arise 'out of private pique and resentment,' feelings of which the indulgence had more than once caused great embarrassment to the Government, and must be curbed. He could not, however, refuse to postpone the entire rearrangement for a time, since the king was on the point of starting for Ireland, and professed an especial desire to be attended by Lord Sidmouth as Home Secretary, whose retirement was a portion of the intended changes. But he gave the King fair notice that he should renew the proposal, as one desirable, not only for the public service, but also 'for the dignity of the Crown, which had always been lowered by any attempt to act on the principle of exclusion.'

But, when 1822 arrived, and Lord Sidmouth carried out his wish of retiring, it seemed, for a moment, as if the postponement had answered the King's purposes, and circumstances were stronger than the Minister. Canning had become apprehensive that the avowed ill-will of the King must render his situation in the Cabinet so unpleasant, that he was inclined to seek a way out of the difficulty by listening to the suggestion that he should succeed Lord Hastings as Governor-General of India. The King caught gladly at an expedient

¹ Letter to Mr. Arbuthnot, *Life*, iii. 146.

which would remove him out of the way, and for a few weeks there was a probability that the great orator would be transferred to a sphere where one of his most conspicuous talents would be wholly thrown away; though India is so grand a field for statesmanship of all kinds, that, had the catastrophe which detained him at home been different, we will not say that the benefits which that great dependency might have reaped from the rule of so largeminded and vigorous a governor would not, in its advantage to the whole nation, have counterbalanced the loss to the council at home.

But events were stronger than the will of kings. The session of 1822 was occupied by an unusual number of debates of great importance, on almost every variety of subject, on the condition of Ireland, on the political disabilities of the Roman Catholics, on finance, on freedom of trade, on Parliamentary reform, on the amelioration of the criminal law; while the state of the Continent, where the wildest schemes of revolution were afloat, where the members of the Holy Alliance were putting one army in motion in Italy, and the King of France was openly proposing to take the field with another, to crush the Spanish revolutionists, was such as to require unceasing vigilance on the part of those who were anxious to prevent the outbreak of a fresh war. As leader of the House of Commons, and Foreign Secretary, every question, whether of foreign or domestic policy, almost equally claimed the attention of Lord Londonderry, and his health gave way under the strain. The session was scarcely over before it became evident to all who saw him that his brain was affected. In the second week of August he was attacked by a fever of great violence, attended with delirium, and in one of its paroxysms he put an end to his life.

His death, even apart from its painful circumstances, was a heavy loss to the country and to the Ministry. The King, too, who had a strong personal liking for him, was not unaffected by it; but it is curiously characteristic of the selfish tenacity with which he cherished resentment, that, among the possible consequences of the calamity, that which first occupied his mind was the probability that Canning would be proposed as Lord Londonderry's successor at the Foreign Office. The news reached him in Scotland, to which part of his dominions the success of his visit to Ireland in the preceding year had induced him to pay a similar compliment. And from Edinburgh he wrote at once to Lord Liverpool that what had happened was 'not to interrupt and on no account to impede the arrangements which were already

settled respecting India; as it was his decision that they should remain final and unalterable.' He wrote, he added, 'for the purpose of guarding Lord Liverpool against any new negotiations with the individual in question.' It almost seemed as if he could not bear to mention his name. And he set himself at once, with curious impropriety, to coax some of the other Ministers to thwart what he was convinced would be the wishes of their chief. He reckoned on the resolute opposition of Lord Eldon to the Roman Catholic claims indisposing him to Canning, who supported them; and, as Mr. Peel was the Minister in attendance on him, he tried to stimulate his ambition by the bait of the leadership of the House of Commons, which could not be his if Canning resumed his place in the Cabinet. Peel, cautious from his earliest days, begged the royal permission to abstain from replying.¹ And his Majesty, having thus disburthened his mind, and, as he hoped, put sufficient obstacles in the way of his Prime Minister, devoted himself for the next week or two to enjoying the honours prepared for him by the citizens, who exulted in flattering themselves that they had nine parts in the representative of the Stuarts and of their own ancient line of sovereigns.

Thirty years afterwards Macaulay made merry at the idea of a king thinking to give a striking proof of his respect for the country and its ancient usages 'by disguising himself in what, before the Union, was considered by nine Scotchmen out of ten as the dress of a thief.'² But, though those who wore the tartan were in fact but a comparatively small portion of the population of the kingdom, it is certain that at the time Lowlanders as well as Highlanders were gratified by the stately monarch's adoption of what they agreed in accepting as the national garb. The details of the procession, the receptions, and all the various ceremonies and festivities under the management of Walter Scott could not fail of success, and for the time Edinburgh gave itself up to as enthusiastic a loyalty as Dublin in the preceding year. The King again publicly drank the health of his hosts in tumblers of whisky, hoping, perhaps, thereby to strengthen himself for the struggle which he foresaw on his return to the South.

He did not deceive himself. The death of Lord Londonderry had in Lord Liverpool's opinion rendered the acquisition of Canning, as the only man who could replace him, absolutely indispensable. Before the King reached London he

¹ Peel's Letter to Lord Liverpool, *Life*, iii. 195.

² *History of England*, c. xiii. vol. iii. p. 213.

had announced to his colleagues that his continuance as Prime Minister depended on it; and, though Lord Eldon was not the only one of his colleagues who confessed a preference for some one else, Lord Melville, the First Lord of the Admiralty, even proposing that the vacant Seals should be entrusted to the Duke of Wellington, his authority, as a matter of course, prevailed. And, at his first interview with the King, he stated it not only as his own, but as the unanimous decision of the whole Cabinet, that Canning should be invited to become Lord Londonderry's successor.

As he expected, the King refused. Again, his Majesty declared that 'his private honour was concerned,' and tried to obtain the concurrence of the Duke of Wellington, apparently with a half-formed plan of taking the Duke for Prime Minister, if Lord Liverpool retired. But to his dismay, he found the Duke as convinced as Lord Liverpool himself that Canning was indispensable. The great soldier was always plain-spoken, but there was no little ingenuity in his argument. If two private individuals had quarrelled, he might have thought them bound to lay aside their private feelings from a regard to the public interests; but, when a King was offended with a subject, then, he argued, that the honour of a King 'consists in acts of mercy and grace,' and that his Majesty's 'honour would be quite safe in extending his grace and favour to Mr. Canning.' And he also expressed his entire conviction that Canning had never 'intended to do anything displeasing to the King.' The Ministers had a coadjutor out of the Cabinet in Lady Conyngham, who gave significant hints of her desire to be understood as contributing to the end desired; and, finally, the King, whose firmness in adhering to any cause was often in exactly an inverse ratio to his positiveness in announcing his intentions, adopted the Duke's suggestion. In a note to Lord Liverpool he announced that he 'sacrificed his private feelings' to what was recommended to him 'for the good of the public service;' enclosing another to be shown to Canning himself, which stated that 'the King was aware that the brightest ornament of his crown was the power of extending grace and favour to a subject who might have incurred his displeasure; and, *therefore*, he permitted Lord Liverpool to propose Mr. Canning's readmission to the Government.'¹

It may, perhaps, be thought that this pompous parade of forgiveness showed too much ill-temper to be quite in accordance with the grace on which his Majesty usually prided

¹ *Life*, iii. 200.

himself. But even now Lord Liverpool's difficulties were not quite over, since Canning had learnt to look forward to his Indian Government with considerable satisfaction, and Lord Liverpool was forced to press very strongly on him that 'a sense of public duty' must prevent him from declining the offer he made to him; adding 'an expression of his conviction that his Majesty would never have given his consent if he had not determined to afford him the fullest confidence that might be necessary for the discharge of his duties;' a conviction very honourable to the writer, since others would have thought it not quite in harmony with his Majesty's conduct towards himself; but one which must be admitted to have been in a great degree justified by the event, since in after years Canning more than once spoke of the King's behaviour to him as everything that he could desire; while in 1827 the King, even at the very moment of struggling most obstinately against the necessity of giving him still higher promotion, admitted to one of the Minister's avowed enemies that 'since Canning had been Secretary of State he had behaved considerably and well towards himself in every respect.'¹

For the object of gaining the King's confidence it was probably fortunate that Canning had at once an opportunity of showing that his own views of foreign policy were identical with those of his predecessor. A third congress was on the point of assembling at Vienna, where the principal questions to be discussed were the insurrection in Spain, and the desire of France to interfere by force in behalf of King Ferdinand. Lord Londonderry had been intended to represent Great Britain. He was now replaced by the Duke of Wellington; but the instructions which he had submitted to the Cabinet for his own guidance were now furnished without alteration to the Duke, their leading principle being that of resolute non-intervention, and a steady avoidance of any act or even word which could be tortured into an approval of the scheme of the Holy Alliance. And during the rest of Canning's career there is not the slightest reason to think that our policy in Europe differed in its leading features from that which, had he lived, would have been pursued by Lord Londonderry.

Still, the change that had taken place was not merely a change of the Minister's name. His measures, though in general the same as his predecessor's, were undoubtedly, in many instances, prompted by different motives. When the Duke of Cumberland, who aimed at the reputation of being

¹ Conversation of George IV. with Lord Londonderry, April 1827. — *Well. Desp.* iii. 633.

a sayer of good things, described Canning as 'a poetical politician,' his Royal Highness was probably confounding the imaginative and picturesque oratory with which he explained or defended his measures with the measures themselves. Even the step which, as Canning afterwards vaunted it to the House, had most of the poetical character, the recognition of the South American republics, was no new idea of his own, but only the development of an old national policy begun by Pitt, continued by Fox and Grenville, and of late steadily contemplated by Lord Liverpool. But the arguments by which he justified it were his own, and his motives were not wholly those of the statesmen who first interfered in the affairs of the Transatlantic colonies of Spain. Their aim was to extend our commerce, and to prevent France enriching herself with the produce of the Mexican and Peruvian mines. He was more influenced by sympathies with peoples battling for liberty, and endeavouring to establish their independence. To use a word then beginning to be applied to politics, there was a tinge of 'liberalism' in his mind, likely to be misunderstood at first by both those who professed and those who denounced the principles intended to be described by the new term; but most of all misunderstood by those advocates of extreme opinions who distorted his advocacy of true liberty into a sympathy with their own revolutionary and republican theories, which no man was less inclined to tolerate.

Those had more foundation for their anticipations who, from his position as Secretary of State, expected an increase of strength to the party opposed to the Roman Catholic disabilities. For, though Lord Londonderry had also been favourable to their views, the support he gave them was of a more passive character; while Canning, during his late secession from office, had actually brought forward a Bill for the partial relief of the Roman Catholics, which, though confined to the case of peers, must, if carried, inevitably have led to the emancipation, as it was called, of the whole body. One great evil of these restrictions was, indeed, the insurmountable obstacle which they presented to the formation of a perfectly united administration. 'Open questions,' even when of slight moment, are a sign and source of weakness in a Ministry. But for it to be found necessary so to deal with what for years was the most important of all questions of domestic policy, was the strongest proof of the desirableness, the absolute necessity, of settling it, since a divided government must be a weak one, and no nation can stand a long succession of weak governments.

One of the most important results of Canning's return to the Ministry was the promotion of a great political economist and financier—Mr. Huskisson, one of the members for Liverpool—to a post which made his peculiar talents available for the service of the country. Lord Liverpool himself had learnt from his old master, Pitt, the importance of political economy, and entertained large and sound views on the subject of freedom of trade. But such questions as yet occupied the attention of but few members of either House, and, of those few, no one in the Commons could be compared to Mr. Huskisson, who was quite thrown away as First Commissioner of the Woods and Forests, the only office previously found for him. But, at the beginning of 1823, the retirement of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster enabled the Prime Minister to place Mr. Robinson at the Exchequer, and to give his post of President of the Board of Trade to Huskisson. The King, who had recovered his good humour, and now addressed him in letters as 'My dear Liverpool,' which he probably meant to be taken as a very marked condescension,¹ agreed to all his proposals, even volunteering an offer to waive his own wish for a reduction of the number of members of the Cabinet. And for some time the Government went on in unusual harmony, alike on questions of internal and foreign policy. At home taxes were reduced, restrictions were relaxed, yet the revenue exceeded the expenditure more largely than ever; while, if it was an act of graceful sentiment rather than of statesmanship, the reversal of the attainders of those Scotch peers who had suffered the penalties of treason in the preceding century, was yet not without a certain significance, as a proof of the care of the Minister to extinguish every feeling of discontent or soreness in every class of the population. Abroad the unswerving firmness with which the Duke of Wellington carried out his instructions at Verona completely baffled the ambitious designs of Russia, and confined the war, which all saw to be inevitable, to the invasion of Spain by France; and a year or two later, when Spain in its turn invaded Portugal, Canning carried not only the House but the nation with him, when he compared England under the existing Ministry to the Æolus of the Latin poet, swaying the sceptre, softening the wrath of nations, and preventing it from throwing the world into confusion, and proclaimed as one guiding principle of our policy that the stan-

¹ George IV., who occasionally wrote to the Duke of Wellington and Lord Eldon, commonly addressed them as 'My dear Friend.'

dard of England should ever be as sure a defence to her allies as to herself against foreign dominion.

During all these years the Catholic question was continually appearing in various forms: whether Roman Catholics in England might be allowed to vote at elections as they did in Ireland: whether the Duke of Norfolk might be permitted to discharge the duties of his hereditary office of Earl Marshal: one Peer, Lord Darnley, proposed appropriating part of the revenues of the Irish Church to the support of the Roman Catholic clergy: in the House of Commons, Lord Francis Leveson-Gower carried a resolution for the endowment of that clergy from the national revenue: and in all these discussions the King took a lively personal interest. In earlier life he had been so warm an advocate of Catholic Emancipation, as it was commonly called, that he had presented a memorial to Pitt, requesting the appointment of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, for the express purpose of carrying it out. But, though we do not know the date of the change, time had altered his opinions, and he now professed a repugnance to Emancipation as earnest as had been entertained by his father; while the brother to whom he was most attached, the Duke of York, took the same view, and in 1825 caused no little excitement by calling God to witness that, 'whatever might be his situation in life,' he would adhere to it 'to the latest moment of his existence.' The King was not entirely pleased with language which seemed to intimate that the speaker was contemplating the possibility of his succession to the throne; telling Lord Liverpool that 'he had no intention of vacating it for him at present,' but he was highly delighted with a speech that the Prime Minister himself made on the same occasion. He wrote to him on purpose to thank him for it; and throughout the last year of his administration treated him with a marked increase of cordiality.

In one instance he showed it in a way which supplies an amusing revelation of the principles on which honours are distributed at Courts. On the dissolution of his first Parliament, the Minister proposed to him to make a small addition to the Peerage, being, as a matter of course, guided in his selection by purely political considerations. The King did not object to any of those whom he was asked to ennoble, though one or two were not exactly those whom he himself would have chosen. But he desired also to add one or two whom he regarded as personal friends of his own: and in a graciously playful note pressed the addition of their names,

volunteering a condition that 'he will consider himself as owing Lord Liverpool a Peer at any future period.'¹

'Peace and harmony,' his Majesty said, 'were his great object.' And in 1825-6, the last years of Lord Liverpool's ministry, several circumstances rendered it more than usually desirable that perfect cordiality should be known to exist between the King and his Minister, so that abroad, as well as at home, the Government should have the reputation of strength. At home, owing partly to the resumption of cash payments, and still more to the spirit of speculation which was engendered by the natural desire to take advantage of the general feeling of peace and security to find employment for money, a great commercial collapse took place, long remembered as the panic of 1825. For a few weeks, bankruptcy after bankruptcy, both in London and the provinces, shook mercantile credit in every part of the country. The distress was great: the fear of still greater distress was universal. It was well for the nation that at such a crisis a man who combined great knowledge of political economy with unshaken firmness was at the head of the Government: for theorists of all kinds poured into the Treasury schemes of all sorts for remedying the evil. But Lord Liverpool saw that Government interference would only complicate and protract the evil: he left it to the Bank, as the proper centre of finance and public credit, to deal with the difficulty; and the natural resources of the country, getting time to work, recovered with a rapidity as remarkable as that of their collapse. But though refusing to allow the Government to overstep its proper sphere, he wisely availed himself of the impression created by the season of trial to put the whole banking system of the country on a sounder footing, and the establishment of provincial joint-stock banks is due to the relaxation of the previously existing laws which the crisis of 1825 suggested to him.

Events, too, were happening in foreign countries, which it was easy to see might render it most desirable for the British Government to speak with a voice of authority. In 1824, Louis XVIII. died, and it was impossible to contemplate without uneasiness the exchange of a king who, if a voluptuary and to some extent a sceptic, was also a shrewd man of the world, and an acute judge of the character of his people and of the temper of the age, for a priest-ridden bigot such as his brother, who succeeded him with the title of Charles X., had latterly become. And a few months afterwards the death

¹ *Life*, iii. 379.

of the Emperor of Russia brought with it more immediate perplexities. It may not indeed be positively certain that he was poisoned, though it was, and is the general belief; and it may be that among the reasons which influenced his next brother Constantine's refusal to succeed him was a not unnatural disinclination to become ruler of a people which looked on assassination as a part of their legitimate charter.¹ But in whatever way Alexander died, and whatever may have been Constantine's reasons for declining the throne, it was certainly probable that the accession of Nicholas would produce a change in the policy of Russia which must affect us. There had been for some years a strong war party in that country, which Alexander professed to have great difficulty in restraining, but with which Nicholas was inclined to sympathise. The sovereign with whom war was desired was the Sultan, whose European possessions had been coveted by every Czar and Czarina for the last half century. And the pretext for it was sought in a rebellion of the people, largely caused and fomented by Russian intrigues. In fact, they were eager to renew their attempts on the partition of Turkey, which had only been interrupted fifteen years before by the necessity of defending themselves against Napoleon, and from which, since that time, they have never desisted. But though we could hardly be said to have a direct interest in preserving the Ottoman Empire, Lord Liverpool's statesmanlike anxiety to preserve peace, and his equally sound conviction that peace could hardly be secure in Western Europe if hostilities were raging in the East, led him to regard the designs of Russia with uneasiness; and he once more had recourse to the diplomatic ability of the Duke of Wellington, or perhaps it should rather be said, of the influence which his share in the overthrow of Napoleon had given him with the Russian sovereigns, and sent him on a special mission to St. Petersburg, professedly to congratulate Nicholas in his accession, but really to persuade him to moderate his dealings with Turkey.

The Duke succeeded for the time; and perhaps the line of conduct which he induced the Czar to adopt might have been persevered in, had Lord Liverpool remained at the helm. But great changes were at hand. His long and successful administration was drawing to a close. In the first week of

¹ 'I should not be surprised if Constantine were to abdicate. This act will show that he agrees with others in thinking that assassination is the legitimate charter of the Russian people.'—*Duke of Wellington to Canning: Desp.* iii. 57.

1827 the Duke of York died, after a lingering and most painful illness. He was the favourite brother of the King, who felt his loss as keenly as it was in his nature to feel anything, telling every one who approached him how inexpressible and irreparable it was to him, but comforting himself characteristically by planning all the details of a magnificent state funeral. And before the end of February Lord Liverpool, who had been ailing all the preceding autumn, was struck down by paralysis, from which, though he lingered till the end of the next year, he never recovered.

It was a melancholy end of an Administration which, as it was one of the longest, had been one of the most glorious recorded in our annals. It had commenced under unprecedented difficulties both at home and abroad; but it had triumphed over them all, over the foreign enemy, over adversaries in Parliament, and over other troubles, scarcely less formidable, which inevitably arose from the reaction consequent on the re-establishment of peace. And for its success it was mainly indebted to the character and talents of the Prime Minister himself. His previous career had given him peculiar advantages for the task of presiding over the Cabinet at such a crisis. He had had a seat at the India Board; he had been Master of the Mint; he had held the seals of the Home, the Foreign, and the Colonial Offices: so that there was scarcely a single department of the Government with whose details and working he had not a personal acquaintance.

And his natural abilities were such as excellently qualified him to make full use of the practical knowledge which he had thus acquired. He was not indeed endowed with any original or striking brilliancy of genius, but he had in a high degree strong sound common sense, penetration, decision, and courage. His eloquence, again, was not distinguished by any flights of imagination, but it was sufficiently animated, full of information, logical, luminous, and so invariably candid that one of his most persevering opponents, Mr. Brougham, has admitted that there never was an orator less open to the reproach of shirking difficulties or of misrepresenting in the most trivial point the statements or arguments of an adversary. His absolute freedom from intrigue and corruption of every kind was never called in question, and, though no one ever exercised a more independent judgment, or was more firm or unyielding when principle was in question, his tact and address were such as enabled him not only to reconcile the jarring pretensions or conflicting views of his colleagues, but, far harder task, to acquire and retain the respect and confidence

of a most capricious master, who was long before he forgot that he had originally been forced upon him by circumstances and occupied a post which he would have preferred to fill with a servant of a very different character. That he should have left the kingdom, as he did leave it, prosperous at home and universally respected abroad, was not only a great achievement, but one in which it may fairly be said that Fortune had exercised less than her proverbial share.

ART. III.—THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

1. *Raynoldus de Libris Apocryphis*, Vol. I. (Oppenheim, 1611.)
2. *Christiani Kortholti de Canone Scripturæ Tractatus*. (Kiel, 1686.)
3. *Lorini Comment. in Librum Sapientiæ Salomonis*. (Mainz, 1608.)
4. *The Dean of Canterbury's Bampton Lectures*, Appendix. (London, 1869.)
5. *Miscellanea Berolinensia*, Vol. VI. (Berlin, 1710.)
6. *The Expositor*, Nos. 5 and 6. (London, 1875.)

IN the ancient Greek and Latin editions of the Old Testament, the Song of Solomon is followed by two ancient treatises, which, though not found in the Hebrew Canon, have been held in high repute by Jews and Christians, and have been regarded as a kind of appendix to the acknowledged and inspired writings of Solomon. These treatises are entitled 'The Wisdom of Solomon' and 'The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach.' They are cited by the ancient writers of the Church from the earliest times in illustration both of doctrine and practical duty. They were extensively employed in the Divine offices, and recommended to the study of the faithful as being profitable for reproof and correction, and for instruction in righteousness. They are included with the Canonical writings of Solomon as 'Sapiential books,' containing the moral precepts either of Solomon himself or of those who were followers and imitators of the wisest of men.

The first of these books bears the title of 'The Wisdom of Solomon.' The first part of the treatise is of the form of an

address to kings and rulers, which is put into the mouth of Solomon, and ends with a prayer for wisdom, in which the king seeks help from above in the government of the people of God. Hence many ancient writers not only quote it as Solomon's, but even urge the second chapter in the controversy with the Jews as a true prophecy of Christ's crucifixion, uttered more than a thousand years before the events occurred. It is quoted as a prophecy in the Epistle of Barnabas, in S. Hippolytus, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Theophilus, Lactantius, and others. It is quoted by S. Augustine and S. Ambrose as Solomon's.

'The Book of Wisdom' is also quoted by the Pseudo-Dionysius, in the treatise *De Divinis Nominibus*, as an authority for the passionate or erotic form of devotion. To these authorities Bellarmine added that of the Council of Sardica, in which the seventh chapter of Wisdom was alleged to prove the doctrine that the Son of God was Creator of all things and truly a Divine Person. He also wrote:

'The Council of Toledo names it as the eleventh book of Holy Scripture. Melito places it in his catalogue of the Scriptures. Cyprian quotes the words "What hath pride profited us?" as Scripture. Cyril calls the book "Divine Scripture." S. Augustine actually argues that doctrines may be proved from this book; and Eusebius says that Hegesippus, Irenæus, and the whole company of ancient writers supposed it to be Solomon's.'

This array of authorities is found, however, to melt away beneath the severe criticism of his opponents in the controversy. In referring to the authority of Eusebius, he was misled by Ruffinus' Latin version, for Eusebius spoke of the Book of Proverbs, which was called by the ancients *Σοφία πανάρετος*. This also applies to the quotation from Melito. The name 'Wisdom' is also applied to Proverbs by Clemens Alexandrinus, Gregory Nazianzen, the Trullan Council, the Apostolical Constitutions, Theophanes, Chrysostom and others.

The Pseudo-Dionysius, in quoting the words *ἐραστὴς ἐγενόμην τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῆς*, says that they are found in the 'introductions of the oracles,' not in the oracles themselves; and the context would lead to the supposition that he would have placed 'The Book of Wisdom' in the same relative position to the Old Testament which the Epistles of Ignatius hold to the New. After showing that Scripture was on his side, he proceeds to allege the *ιερόλογοι*, who might be theologians or commentators on Scripture, and not themselves divinely inspired. Their teaching was not Scripture, but

introduction to Scripture. Several writers of antiquity who use or recommend 'The Book of Wisdom' make this distinction elsewhere in their writings. In the 76th Canon of the Apostles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle are mentioned as works of Solomon; whilst the Wisdom of the learned Siracides is recommended to the young. S. Athanasius, in his 39th Festal Epistle, after reciting the Canonical books, says, 'There are others besides those which have been enumerated which belong not to the Canon, but are recommended by the Fathers to be read to those who have lately come to us, and desire instruction in the way of godliness.' Presently he names 'The Book of Wisdom.' Yet he was one of those who subscribed the decrees of the Sardican Council, whence it appears that the allegation of a book was not necessarily the ascribing to it of inspired authority. S. Chrysostom in one place (vol. iv. p. 153) quotes it as the work of a certain wise man (*σόφους τις*). S. Augustine in three places expresses doubts as to its authorship. In the *De Civitate Dei* (lib. xvii. 20), and the *De Doctrinâ Christianâ* (lib. ii. 9), he says that though the custom has obtained of ascribing it to Solomon, yet the learned doubt not that it is not Solomon's; that both Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are on account of a certain similarity said to be Solomon's, but that the author of both was Jesus the Son of Sirach. The latter assertion he corrects in his *Retractationes* (lib. ii. c. 4). In his treatise *De Prædestinatione* (lib. i. c. 14), he quotes Wisdom iv. 11, 'Raptus est ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus;' adding, 'dictum est, a quocunque sit dictum.' Kortholt¹ refers to 'M. Antonius de Dominis,' who, in a work *De Republ. Eccl.*, vii. 1, 34, gives this gloss on the passage: 'When S. Augustine used "Wisdom" in the controversy with the Pelagians, his opponents in Gaul objected to him that "Wisdom" was not a Canonical book. The book was therefore not universally accepted as Divine. Nor did Augustine reply that it was so received, but only that it was not devoid of a certain degree of authority, because some learned men had used it as if it was Scripture.'

The Hebrew Canon is, as it is well known, supported by many of the catalogues given by ancient writers; and in particular by S. Basil, S. Epiphanius, and S. Jerome. Of these S. Basil is supposed to refer 'The Book of Wisdom' to Philo, because of the tradition about the manna adapting itself to various tastes, which he ascribes to Philo. Jerome

¹ *De Canone Scripturæ*, p. 237.

says that it was the opinion of many that Philo was the author, and in two places he quotes it as 'The Wisdom that is ascribed to Solomon,' adding, 'if it pleases any one to receive the book.'

Dr. Plumptre says (*Expositor*, pp. 330-1): 'In an obscure and probably corrupt passage of the Muratorian Canon, about A.D. 160, it is stated to have been written *ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius*. This is supposed by some critics to represent an original Greek text ὑπὸ Φίλωνος, "by Philo," which the writer of the fragment mistook for ὑπὸ φίλων, "by his friends." Dr. Tregelles thinks that as it is mentioned after the Catholic Epistles, it could not have been recognised as belonging to the Old Testament, and argues from this for its Christian authorship.'

According to Wolfius, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, vol. ii. p. 199, the book was called by the Jews 'The Book of Wisdom,' or 'The Great Wisdom of the Rabbi Solomon.' Rabbi Moses Nachmanides says that it was extant in Chaldee, and that he had seen the copy with his own eyes. Rabbi Azariah, in the *Meor Enajim*, expresses a doubt whether it was a version or the original. He says, 'It might have been composed by King Solomon in Syriac to send to some king in the remote East.' It was not, however, admitted into the Canon, because Ezra recognised the books in the Holy Tongue alone as inspired. Rabbi Gedaliah, in the *Schalscheleth Hakkabala*, says, 'Some think that King Solomon wrote it.'

Among later authors, the defenders of Solomon's authorship have generally attempted to reconcile this with the manifestly Greek style and diction which it presents, by a supposition that it is a compilation or a collection of traditional sayings of Solomon by a later hand. Grotius, however, conjectured that the Greek edition was not the original, but a free translation of an older Chaldee or Hebrew work.

'The exhortations,' he thought, 'were such as Solomon could have dictated. The author lived after the time of Ezra, before the time of Simeon the high priest. Hence it is prefixed to the Book of Ben Sirach. It was translated by some Christian into Greek in a free and elegant style, adding some Christian ideas in suitable places. This happened also to the Book of Ben Sirach, but to him in the Latin version more than in the Greek. I say this, not as denying that after Ezra's time there began to be a fuller propounding of the patience of the godly, of universal judgment, of eternal life and the punishments of hell, but because certain phrases are more Evangelical in style than those of later times.'

Similar views were propounded by Houbigant. "The Book of Wisdom," he says, 'is either the fragment of a larger work, or if it was originally a separate treatise, the beginning is wanting. But in that it is a prophecy of the world fighting against the wicked, and of the slaying of the righteous, the name must have been originally prefixed, for no prophecies in Scripture are anonymous.' He held that the two divisions of the book—chap. i.-ix. and x.-xix.—were by two different authors; that the former part, in which the prophecies occur, might be Solomon's; but the latter part by some other author, perhaps by the Greek translator of the first part.

In the Syriac Version the title is as follows: 'Here follows the Book of the Great Wisdom of Solomon, the son of David, concerning which it is doubtful whether it was written by some other wise man of the Hebrews endued with the prophetic spirit, the name of Solomon being added, and the book thus received as his work.'

The opinion of Solomon's partial authorship has, however, been generally abandoned both by those who uphold the canonical authority of the book, and by the impugnors of it; the whole internal evidence of the book being such as to denote an Egyptian or Alexandrian origin. Hence a large amount of testimony may be adduced in favour of the authorship of the great Alexandrian Jew, Philo. Among the ancients it has already been observed that Jerome, Basil, and the Muratorian Canon are favourable to this conclusion. It has even been supposed that the name Philo has a latent mystical connexion with 'Solomon,' for *Φίλων* is connected with the verb *φιλεῖν*, 'to love,' and thus with Jedidiah, 'the beloved of the Lord,' which is a title of Solomon in Scripture. The Rabbi Azariah calls Philo 'Jedidiah.' (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* iii. 29, 3; Wolfii, *Bibl. Hebr.* i. 974.) He is thus described in the *Schalscheleth Hakkabala*: 'Nearly one hundred years before the destruction of the Temple, there was another Jew, well skilled in Jewish matters, and a wonderful philosopher, Philo Judæus of Alexandria. He was the author of various books in Greek, as also of the book called "Wisdom," which the Gentiles include in their Bibles, supposing it to be Solomon's.' The Rabbi antedates the great Philo by more than half a century, but he clearly refers to him, and not to another author of the same name. The advocates of Philo's authorship can point to many remarkable resemblances, both in style and matter, between his known writings and 'The Book of Wisdom.' In both there are traces of an intimate acquaintance with the doctrines of

Platonism ; the plagues are described in Wisdom, as in Philo's Life of Moses, from an Egyptian point of view. Many of the sublimest sayings in Wisdom, concerning the human soul, the happiness of the wise, the impiety of idolatry, and the Divine inspiration, have their parallels in the allegories of Philo. The passage which has been most often alleged is Wisd. viii. 7, concerning the four cardinal virtues—'temperance, prudence, justice, and fortitude.' This is manifestly a point of contact with the ethics of pagan philosophy. It also answers to the allegory of Philo, that the river out of Eden is virtue in general, and that the four heads are the four virtues emanating from the wisdom of God. It has been usual for those who ascribe Wisdom to Philo, to connect it with his celebrated legation to Caligula upon the subject of his profanation of the Temple at Jerusalem, when Petronius was ordered to erect the statue of the Emperor in the holy place. The mention of tyrants and oppressors has been thought to be an allusion to the Roman oppressors of the Jews. 'All the enemies of my people (xv. 14) that oppress them are most foolish,' has been often quoted, not only as unsuitable to the age of Solomon, but as answering exactly to the state of the Jews under Caligula. Thus Dr. T. Jackson (*Works*, vol. vii. p. 250) says: 'Their opinion is not improbable who think this book was written by Philo the Jew to solace himself and his countrymen upon the ill success of his embassy to Caius the Emperor, which was not many years after our Saviour's death, nor many before S. Paul did write his Epistle to the Hebrews.'

The passage which has been most quoted in support of this theory is as follows:—'All the enemies of Thy people that hold them in subjection are most foolish . . . for they counted all the idols of the heathen to be gods.' Hence it has been inferred (1) that the Jews must have been at the time not only subject to heathen rulers, but oppressed by them (*καταδυναστεύειν*); (2) that the particular tyranny was that of the Roman Empire, which, in its system of community of religions, and the admission of the gods of conquered nations into the Pantheon, 'counted all the idols of the heathen to be deities.' Thus Leo the Great, in his sermon on the Apostles Peter and Paul, says that 'Rome believed that she had invented a great comprehensive religion, which should reject the belief of no nation as false.' (Raynoldus, vol. i. p. 174.) Again, it was argued from Wisdom viii. 15, 'Horrible tyrants shall be afraid when they do but hear of me,' as well as from the manner in which the tyranny of the Egyptians of

old is dwelt upon in the latter part of the book, chap. xii. and xvi., that the author's purpose was to encourage the Jews by the hope of speedy vengeance overtaking Caligula and the agents of his cruelty and impiety. The denouncing of idols, which occupies so large a part of the book, falls in with this conjecture; and the assertion of the hope of immortality was calculated to move the Jews to brave another persecution like that of the Maccabæan age. (Raynoldus, i. p. 180.) Petrus Galatinus, however, supposed that Philo became a Christian, and wrote the book to show (as in chap. ii.) that the predictions of the prophets had been fulfilled in our Lord. But the grounds given for ascribing Wisdom to the great Philo fall short of conviction. In the first place, the opinion mentioned by Jerome was not generally entertained by the ancient Jews or Christians. (Wolfius, *Bibl. Hebr.* vol. i. p. 974.) The internal evidence of the book exhibits both style and matter unlike that of the known works of Philo. If Philo had written a work on the Divine Wisdom, he would probably have made Moses the great philosopher, and not Solomon; and though a description of Wisdom might be compiled by extracts from the works of Philo, bearing a resemblance to that of 'The Book of Wisdom,' the general line of thought, and the mode of handling the ancient Scriptures which is found in the latter, is widely different. The author of Wisdom grounded his arguments chiefly upon the literal sense of Scripture. In Philo's allegories we find a tendency to abandon the letter for the abstract truths which were supposed to be shadowed forth in the sacred narrative, and to explain away the obvious meaning of the text. For instance, the author of Wisdom had in his mind the clear notion of a personal tempter effecting the ruin of man. (Wisdom ii. 24.) Philo, on the contrary, conceived that the man enticed by the serpent through the woman signified the masculine 'intellect' (*νοῦς*) depraved by 'pleasure' through the feminine 'sensation' (*αἰσθησις*). The author of Wisdom believed that the consequence of the Fall was bodily disease and decay. (Wisdom i. 13, 14.) Philo's teaching was that sin slew the soul and not the body. The miracle of the brazen serpent is treated historically in Wisdom xvi. But in Philo it is taken as representing the rule of temperance as opposed to the deadly effects of pleasure or fleshly indulgence. The author of Wisdom meditates upon the historical facts of the Scripture record; but Philo dwells more largely on the legal ceremonial, and treats the history as a series of allegories repre-

senting abstract ideas.¹ The author of Wisdom also shows a close acquaintance with the Psalms and Prophetical Books, which are rarely used by Philo. It has, therefore, been inferred that 'The Book of Wisdom,' though certainly Alexandrian, represents an earlier and simpler stage of religious and philosophical teaching than that which is so highly developed in the Allegories of Philo. Accordingly it has been a favourite theory of several authors that Wisdom is to be ascribed to another Philo, who was contemporary with Onias, the high priest, about B.C. 160, the author of a work 'On the Soul,' and said to be one of the Seventy. (Lorinus.) This author has been distinguished as Philo Senior. He is mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* lib. ix. 20, 24, by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* lib. i. p. 337, and Josephus, *c. Apionem*, p. 1051. The last author describes him as a pagan, and not a Jew; but Huetius and Drusius attempted to surmount this difficulty by disputing the accuracy of Josephus. (Wolfius, i. p. 974.) Others, abandoning the Philo in Josephus as a pagan and Pythagorean, resort to the hypothesis of a third Philo. This is maintained by Buddæus, in his *History of the Philosophy of the Hebrews*. On the other hand, Fabricius and Raynoldus argued that Jerome referred to the great Philo, and that no other Philo is known to whom it could have been attributed. Indeed, all the researches of the learned have led to no further result or conclusion than that Wisdom was the anonymous work of an Alexandrian Jew, who exhibited at once a deep faith and piety and a considerable acquaintance with the Platonic philosophy and other Greek literature.

The book presents points of contact with the prophetical books, especially with Isaiah, with which it is probably more closely connected than with any of the writings of Solomon. Chapter ii. 11, 12 corresponds with the LXX version of Isaiah iii. 10. *Δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστὶ*; ch. ix. 13, is based upon Isaiah xl. 13; chap. i. 16, concerning 'the covenant with death,' is manifestly derived from Isaiah xxviii. 13-18; and the consolation of the barren and childless, in chap. iii. 14, 15, is founded upon Isaiah lvi. 4, 5. The description of the persecution of the righteous servant of the Lord in Wisdom ii. is partly based upon Isaiah liii. The full exposure of the folly of idol-makers in Wisdom xiii. and xiv. is an expansion of Isaiah xliv. and xlv.

¹ The words *μοσχεύματα* (gardener's slips) and *βάσις*, which are found in Wisdom iv. 3, occur also in a sentence of Philo, but the sense and application of both words are totally different.

These parallels lead to the conclusion that the author was familiar with the prophecies of Isaiah, and that he knew them through a Greek interpretation rather than the Hebrew. It has been usually inferred from the prologue to the Wisdom of Ben Sirach that the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures had been translated into Greek before the 38th year of Ptolemy Euergetes II. (called also Physcon), or the year 132 B.C. The translation of the prophetic books is commonly assigned to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, or about 170 B.C. There seems, therefore, to be no strong objection to the hypothesis that Wisdom was written in Egypt under the Ptolemies, and early in the period between the Maccabees and the Christian era.

It has been argued from the passage in chap. iii. 14, 15, that the book contains traces of the asceticism of the Therapeutæ, who followed the eremitic or contemplative mode of life, and were the forerunners of the Christian monks. Another opinion is in favour of a Christian author, gathering this from chap. ii., which has so obvious an application to the Passion of Christ. Both these passages may, however, be traced to the prophecies of Isaiah; and the former is a consolation of the childless, and not a praise of celibacy.

Dr. Plumptre, in two articles in the *Expositor*, 1875, headed 'The Writings of Apollos,' gives some reasons for supposing that 'The Book of Wisdom' and the Epistle to the Hebrews present different stages of the same mind, before and after embracing Christianity. In support of this theory, he alleges a number of phrases and words which are common to both. Some of these may, however, be traced to a common source elsewhere: and these verbal resemblances fail to establish a general similarity either of style or mode of thought. On the whole, the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits less pagan learning and a more extensive use of the Old Testament Scriptures than 'The Book of Wisdom.' The attributes of faith in Hebrews xi. might seem at first sight to resemble those of wisdom in Wisdom x.; but, upon fuller examination, the scope of the author of Wisdom is found to be wholly different. It may even be urged that there is less in the Epistle to the Hebrews that really elucidates Wisdom, than in other parts of Scripture, or even in some profane writers. The reasons given for assigning the book to a Christian author, or to one of the Therapeutæ, or to Apollos, are, on the whole, of less weight than the arguments for Philo's authorship; and the points of contact between Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus should not be overlooked; for though the books differ in their scope.

and object, they bear marks of being the productions of the same age or period of Hebrew history.

Having given some reasons for differing from Dr. Westcott's and Dr. Plumptre's theories as to the date and author of Wisdom, it remains to consider the imputations that have been made against the book of unsoundness in doctrine. Amongst those who have argued against its canonical authority, some have extolled the book on account of its sublime sayings of faith and piety, as worthy of the estimation in which it has been held by the Christian Church, and a valuable help to devotional meditation; whilst others have disparaged it, and have attempted to prove that it contains dangerous elements of false philosophy and pagan error. Some of the exceptions made to it are of slight importance; as, for instance, when the author is accused of adding his own fancies to the Scripture narrative, in the statement that after the death of the firstborn (chap. xviii. 12), 'the living were not sufficient to bury them.' (Waltherus, *Officina*, p. 1136.) The allusion here is evidently to Numbers xxxiii. 4, where the burial of the firstborn is expressly recorded. It would be a natural inference that the burial would be a hasty one, and that 'the living' would not 'suffice' for the performance of all the accustomed rites of sepulture. Far more weighty are the charges of Brucker in a Dissertation '*De Vestigiis Philosophiæ Alexandrinæ in Libro Sapientiæ*,' published in the *Miscellanea Berolinensia*, vol. vi. p. 150. (Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 346.) This author brings to the question a large store of learning derived from the study of the history and progress of Greek philosophy, and of its earlier and later developments. He argues thus: We find in Wisdom traces of the Platonic and Pythagorean philosophy in a state of degeneracy from the first Academy, and adapting itself to Oriental notions; the same doctrines being afterwards more fully developed in the school of Ammonius at Alexandria. These Platonic ideas are mixed with the teaching derived from the genuine books of Solomon. The Pseudo-Solomon was, therefore, a Platonist. In chap. i. 7, he says: 'the Spirit of the Lord filled the world.' This is apparently based upon Psalm cxxxix. But the Greek *συνεχόν τὰ πάντα* is nearer to the Platonic idea of an '*Anima mundi*,' a bond embracing all, animating and uniting the universe, which is expressed by several pagan authors, and is found in Philo, *De Gigantibus*, p. 287. Mosheim accuses Christian writers of platonising, and describing the Holy Ghost as the 'soul of the world,' holding the different parts together, as the soul of man is the vital

energy of his body. Thus Origen wrote in the 2nd Book *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, and similar expressions are found in the Pseudo-Cyprian, Arnoldus Bonvallensis. S. Cyril of Alexandria, in a sublime passage in his treatise *Contra Julianum*, lib. viii., refers to Plotinus and shows how the operations of the Spirit may be regarded as giving unity, life, and motion to the universe.

Again, in chap. vii. 22, he speaks of the pervading energy of the pure spirit of wisdom, *διὰ πάντων χωροῦν πνευμάτων νοερῶν καθαρῶν λεπτοτάτων*. Now *νοερά* is a common word with the Platonists. They had also the notion of a pure or subtle body which was the *ὄχημα* of the Divine reason, by which it penetrated and contained all souls, and so communicated with corporeal substances. The assertion in chap. xii. 1, that the incorruptible Spirit of God is in all, is also charged with Platonism, as if it declared the Divine Spirit to be equally in the wicked and the good. (But the author surely corrects this misapprehension by his teaching in chap. i. 3-5.) Brucker proceeds to argue that the Vulgate has misrepresented Wisdom i. 14, through the translator's ignorance of Platonic phrases.

'To prove from the world's generation and the nature of things created, that God is not the Author of sin, the Pseudo-Solomon resorts to Platonism. His argument is threefold: (1) that the world in its essential principle was built up by God; (2) that having a good purpose in making the world, He made it very good; (3) that the seat of destruction and corruption is the Greek *ἄδη*, beneath and not above the earth. According to Platonism, God conferred upon the world its goodness and perfection by employing ideas, the eternal bases of existence, by which He imparted form and being to loose matter, when it was pliant, and changeable into various shapes and parts. In the *Timæus* of Plato it is said, "Why did the Author of things ordain their generation and this universe?" "Because He was good, free from all envy: therefore He wished all things to be good like Himself; and thus no evil was added. Tranquillity was given where all had been agitated and confused. It was impossible for Him who was best to make anything but what is most lovely." This beauty of the world is attributed to the application of "ideas" to rude unformed matter. Matter was regarded as something apart from God, as having evil in its nature. The good was from God, the evil from matter; and this evil reigns in some inferior region called Hades.'

But here, if the author of Wisdom speaks of an original creation, in which there was no kingdom of Hades upon earth, he adds from revelation the correction of the Platonic sentiment, 'Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world.'

Brucker next deals with the second chapter of Wisdom, in which he sees much that is pure and excellent, but a departure from the ancient simplicity of the Hebrews, and a turgid and ambitious style. The language which he puts into the mouth of the ungodly is like that ascribed to the sophists; they say that 'strength is the law of justice,' a sentiment familiar to the students of the *Republic* of Plato; the accusation of singularity against the righteous is also a 'sophism.' The whole passage is compared by Clemens Alexandrinus with the saying in the *Republic* about the scourging and impaling of the just man, which appeared to him a near approach to a prophecy of the crucifixion. Brucker also observes that the sensual enjoyments of the impious are described in terms derived from the luxury of the Athenian youth: the wine, and the heads crowned with roses, or the flowers of the spring recall the description in Valerius Maximus of the lascivious youth Polemon. The words in chap. ii. 22, 'neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness,' recall the passage in the *Phædo* of Plato, the last words of Socrates in reply to Cebes, Simmias, and Crito, and others who scorned future rewards and punishments. The mention in chap. vi. 13 of the unfading glory of wisdom is like the praise of *φρόνησις* and *νοῦς* in the *Philebus*. In chap. vii. 17, the description of Wisdom is more like the philosophy of the Greeks than Solomon. It is said to be the knowledge *τῶν ὄντων*, of things that exist, and are immutable, the basis of all sciences, whether physics, astronomy, or chronology; the *ἐπιστήμη* or science of the system of the universe rather than the wisdom of prudence or of the fear of God.

'In chap. vii. 25, wisdom is said to be a pure influence, *ἀπορροία*, or emanation from the Almighty. So the Platonists said that the Divine *νοῦς* or *λόγος* flowed from God as its unchangeable source, or as a ray from the sun, an effluence or emanation of light. Plotinus speaks of God as environed by a splendour of light ever proceeding from Him as a sun. The Jews were naturally attracted by this, for it was like the assertion of their own Scriptures, that God is light and a sun.'

In chap. viii. the author again reverts to the pages of philosophers, who reduced all to four cardinal virtues—'prudence, fortitude, justice, and temperance.' In these they included political virtues, as contributing to human welfare. The knowledge of things which exist, *τῶν ὄντων*, is also extended, as by the Greek philosophy, to include the fore-casting of the future.

In chap. viii. 19, 20, the author adapts the person of

Solomon to Platonic ideas: 'Being good, I came into a body undefiled.' This is the peg upon which the most serious charge against the book has been hung. It has been connected with the passage on the corruptible body weighing down the soul, as showing that the author held not only the pre-existence of the soul, but also 'the essential opposition between matter and spirit,' and the 'inherent badness of matter.' (Payne Smith, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 368.) The idea of the descent of souls into bodies according to their previous merits was, as is well known, common to many systems of heathen philosophy, the Pythagorean and Oriental as well as the Platonic schools. It was supposed that souls, according to their previous dispositions or inclinations, sought for purer bodies, or grosser and inferior modes of existence. This was the origin of the transmigration theory, and the extreme forms of asceticism, the internecine hatred of the body, and the enthusiasm of those who professed to escape from the influence of material objects that they might ascend to God. The Jewish Cabbalists spoke of a descent of souls after obtaining an ethereal clothing in Paradise. In chap. ix. 15 it is said that the earthly tabernacle is a burden to the anxious or thoughtful mind (*νοῦν πολυφρόντιδα*). Brucker saw in this the doctrine of the Platonists that the body is the prison and workshop of the soul, by whose chains it is so impeded that it cannot ascend to its origin until emancipated by a philosophic death from this tyranny. Abstinence from pleasure was therefore advocated in order to sever the soul from commerce with the body, to enable it to pursue philosophic enquiries without the distraction of terrestrial thoughts.

Upon these instances of Platonism it may be observed (1) that the passage about the soul descending into the body has been interpreted by some of the pre-existence of Christ. (Wilberforce on the *New Birth*, p. 16). Thus in a fragment of Gregory of Nyssa (*Gallandi*, vol. vi. p. 583), it is said, 'Who but Christ was good before His birth? And who but the Word incarnate came into a body undefiled?' (2) that the author of Wisdom was asserting the entrance of souls into the world by God's special appointment, in opposition to the impious who say, 'we were born *αὐτοσχεδῶς*, at all adventure,' chap. ii. 2; (3) that the pre-existence of souls in the Creator's foreknowledge and eternal purpose is a Scriptural doctrine asserted in Isaiah xlix. 1, 5; Jeremiah i. 5; (4) that the descent of souls from God is an opinion which a Jew intimate with the doctrines of Plato, and acquainted with Isaiah in the Greek version, would naturally infer from Isaiah lvi. 15, *πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ'*

ἡμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐποίησα, especially when compared with such passages as Jeremiah xxxviii. 16 ; Ecclesiastes iii. 21, xii. 7, &c. That a body without blemish should be appointed for a soul that was good is no more an assertion of the transmigration of souls than the doctrine of the physiognomists, or the connexion between character and bodily form. Still less will the passage about the burden of corruption bear the weight of inference which it is proposed to hang upon it. Dean Payne Smith and Dr. Westcott conclude from it that the author would have 'rejected with horror' the idea of a bodily resurrection, or that his teaching 'leaves no room' for the Christian doctrine on this point. It may be that the more materialising notions of a resurrection, as held by Tertullian in opposition to Marcion, or by Cyril of Jerusalem, and some other Christian writers, would have been unacceptable to him ; but as this doctrine has never been universally received, and some ancient writers argue that there was a carnal form of the belief which Christ deliberately rejected when He taught that in the Resurrection there is no giving in marriage, but they shall be as the angels in heaven, it may be urged that the fullest persuasion of the resurrection of the flesh is consistent with the doctrine that the soul is now clogged and imprisoned by the body. 'Thou sowest not that body that shall be.' 'Flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.' 'We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened.' Such passages show that Platonism, even in its disparagement of the body in its present state, has its points of contact with revealed religion. The glosses of S. Augustine and Hooker are recommended as a juster estimate of the writer's purpose. 'The soul is depressed not by the body, but by its corruption.' Hence it is a prison. 'Bring my soul out of prison.' It is the corruptible thing that must put on incorruption. 'Therefore to depart and to be with Christ is far better.' (Vol. iv. p. 1588.) 'Even when the body is healthful and obedient to the spirit, it is slow in its movements as compared to the soul.' (Vol. v. p. 1116.) 'Hence the soul shrinks from the search for knowledge ; the instruments being weakened where-withal the soul doth work, it preferreth rest in ignorance before wearisome labour to know.' The extreme asceticism which the author of *Wisdom* is supposed to inculcate, has been imported into the book from other sources, such as Josephus and the Essenes.

Having considered the imputations which have made against 'The Book of Wisdom,' we may now turn to the commendations which have been bestowed upon it.

Dr. Thomas Jackson (vol. i. p. 37) says: 'The penman of it was a truly religious sanctified man, who sought to imitate the writings of the prophets, and other writers of the sacred volume.' Again (vol. vii. p. 250) he says: 'The book itself is an excellent and most elegant paraphrase upon many Canonical Scriptures, and contains many exquisite expressions of God's special providence, and infinite wisdom in governing the world, and in overruling both the policy and the power of the greatest princes.' Bishop Bull (vol. i. p. 202) says: 'The book entitled "The Wisdom of Solomon" is an ancient and venerable writing, undoubtedly extant before our Saviour's time, and is a competent and sufficient witness of the faith and belief of the Church in the time wherein it was written.' In chap. ii. 1-20, the author elegantly represents the base and vile sentiments of ungodly infidels concerning the life to come; and in chap. iii. 1-4, he opposes to this wicked doctrine the catholic truth received and believed by the Church of God in his time. John Gregorie (Preface to *Observations on Scripture*) says: "'The Wisdom of Solomon" is a book worthy enough of that name, and comparing with any that was ever written by the hand of man.' There is a high encomium of the book also in Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. v. p. 479.

Hooker, whose general opinion of the value of the Apocryphal Books as a margin to the Old Testament is given in the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, made frequent quotations from this book, and some of his applications of it are amongst the most striking portions of his writings. Jeremy Taylor used the greater part of chap. xvii., on the Egyptian darkness, in his treatise on conscience.

The book manifestly consists of two parts. The first, chap. i.-ix. inclusive, is a homily or, exhortation addressed to the kings and rulers of the earth and terminating with a prayer for wisdom, in which the author speaks in the person and character of Solomon. The second part, chap. x.-xix., is a kind of sequel or appendix, written with a different object, and framed in a devotional form addressed to the Deity; a form suggested by the prayer in chap. ix., which, however, seems to be complete without this continuation. Houbigant supposed that Part II. was by a different author, but this is unnecessary. The diversity of the train of thought is sufficiently accounted for by the supposition that it was written at a different time and with a different purpose. Proofs of the unity of the book may also be alleged: such as the extensive use of Isaiah in both parts; and the development of the idea

in chap. v. of the 'creature' armed against the enemies, by its application to Pharaoh and the Egyptians in chap. xix. There are points of contact between chapters vi. and xii.; and the denunciation of tyrants in the earlier part answers to the judgment of the Egyptian oppressors of Israel which is the subject of the later chapters.

The introduction of Solomon is fictitious and not real. The writer, as a Platonist familiar with the form of philosophic dialogues, in which Cyrus, Socrates, and other names of eminence are introduced as speakers, would naturally adopt a similar form, naming Solomon, the wisest of men, as the great Hebrew philosopher, and doing this without any idea of deception, or of collecting traditional sayings of Solomon, or of founding his doctrine more upon Solomon's teaching than upon any other portion of the Hebrew books or religious traditions. That Solomon is thus introduced is the opinion of Calmet, Raynoldus, Vives, and others. It was a fiction often employed in books on rhetoric or philosophy.

The first object of the author was to exalt the Divine *Σοφία*, the Wisdom derived from the Book of the Covenant of the Most High God (Ecclus. xxiv. 23), in comparison with the human *φιλοσοφία*, which was then in Alexandria asserting its superiority to the Hebrew religion. So Waltherus, *Officina*, p. 1118:

'The sum of the book is to present an encomium of the true Wisdom which is the Word of God. So Luther shows in his Preface at some length. This wisdom, he teaches, consists in the knowledge of God and His works, and of a man's own self also. The disease of idolatry is declared to be the most hostile to wisdom. He therefore speaks of the penalty of idolatry, and the punishment of the wicked, as well as of the duty of princes. The book may be considered as a brief comment on the First Commandment.'

The conception of wisdom is a manifold one. It includes everything that tends to exalt human nature: it is the gift of government, by which man is brought near to God. It embraces all virtues, which are to be learned from God's law. It is the light of truth revealing to the understanding all kinds of knowledge and science, skill in workmanship, or in the control of other men. The true philosophy is the love of God and of His laws, and the study of His revealed will. This being the main object of the first part, there are certain digressions, to speak of the folly of impiety, which degraded man and deprived him of the true wisdom. The chief folly denounced is that of the Epicureans and sensualists, who scorned the expectation of a future state, whose thought was,

'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' (Isaiah xxii. 13.) They thought to make a 'covenant with death,' to be secure when death attacked others, but this covenant should be disannulled. They conspire against the child of God to put him to a shameful death, because he boasted that God was his Father. Their sensual indulgences should bring sudden ruin upon them. Their worldly prosperity should become a snare and a curse to them. Had they a numerous posterity? Their children should be a bastard and degenerate brood corrupted by their vices, and bringing dishonour and discredit upon their parents. But the case of the just, though his life is counted as madness, and his end dishonourable, though he dies childless, with no posterity to perpetuate his name, is the very opposite of this. His death is not a torment, but a translation, a release from evil, and though his life is shortened, this is because, being made perfect in a short time, he has fulfilled a long time.

It may be regarded as a strong protest against Sadducæanism, or the notion of mere earthly rewards as the motive for the practice of virtue; and though the form may be partly borrowed from Greek philosophy, the substance is Scriptural: it represents the faith that armed the Jews to remain constant to their law in the persecution of Antiochus, when they were tortured that they might obtain a better resurrection. Assuming that the wisdom is the Divine law revealed to man for his guidance, the eloquent description of it in chap. vii. is easily applied to the Person and attributes of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit who spake by Moses and the Prophets. Thus Wisdom i. and vii. are well adapted for Pentecostal lessons. They are a devout reflection upon the work of the Paraclete under the Old Covenant, which acquire a deeper meaning when viewed by the light of the New.

It may be argued that the second part of the book, chap. x.-xix., is partly *apologetic*. When the Jews of Alexandria were brought into contact with refined heathenism, they found that there was a necessity, not only to exalt their law by encomiums of the Divine wisdom, but to stand on the defensive, and to answer the cavils and objections of the heathen. A comparison of the tenth chapter with the objections to the ancient Scriptures, quoted by Origen in the fourth book against Celsus, will show that it is an answer to the same cavils as were afterwards advanced by Celsus. Thus Celsus said that Moses impiously described God as weak and impotent, for He was unable to persuade the man that He created to obey Him. In Wisdom x. 1, 2,

we have the earliest positive assertion that Adam was restored after the Fall. The numerous legends which afterwards arose about it are given by Gregorie, Fabricius, and others. They testify to the general belief of Jews and Christians that Adam did not continue in the state of estrangement from God, whether the scene of his sorrow was Moriah, Damascus, or India. Celsus cavilled at the fratricidal fury of Cain and Esau. But the author of *Wisdom* replies that this is recorded to show the ruin that follows the forsaking of wisdom. The preservation of the hope of the world in a frail piece of wood answers to the cavil of Celsus that the story of Noah was the fable of Deucalion, mauled by a Hebrew writer. With reference to the conspiracy of the nations, Celsus said that the division of mankind into languages justified a similar division as to religions and objects of worship. Similarly, the history of Lot and of Jacob's acquisition of wealth were objects of attack. But this apologetic tone becomes more evident when the author proceeds to speak of the destruction of the Canaanites. He argues that their extermination was necessary because they were a cursed race, a seed of evil-doers, who corrupted themselves and others by the vile orgies of their cruel superstition and other vices. He pleads that even in their case judgment was mixed with mercy, for they were expelled gradually, some being taken and others being left, that the survivors might take warning and repent. This leads to some fine sayings about God's patience and deliberation: that His omnipotence is restricted in its exercise by laws of justice and mercy, and that He spares when He might destroy by one word of severity, or might have invented new instruments of vengeance to consume the wicked. But He orders all things by number, measure, and weight. After this, the author proceeds to a lengthy discussion of the evil and folly of idolatry, which, though somewhat tedious, is not without points of interest. He begins by tracing the causes of idolatry. One of these was the excessive admiration either of the beauties of nature, or of the powers at work in the universe. Hence arose the worship of the elements under different names or supposed deities. Men showed great skill in investigating the laws of nature. What excuse had they in failing to perceive the Lord and Maker of all? Then others worshipped kings and heroes; in wide empires men honoured a portrait or sculpture of the king who never showed his face among them. Or doting affection for the dead made the bereaved parent worship the effigy of his child. Then there

were household gods fixed in recesses, and coloured with red ochre; there were nautical idols, the Pataeci of the Phœnicians, which were worshipped by sailors, though they might with more reason adore their ships. There were idols of wood, stone, and various materials, including earthenware, the most fragile of all. The conclusion is that idolatry is 'the beginning, the end, and the cause of all evil,' a passage which has a striking illustration in Tertullian, *De Idololatriâ*. This portion of the book has also some remarkable parallels in the works of Philo.

The last chapters, xvi.-xix., are devoted to a comparison between God's dealings with the Egyptians and with His chosen people. The *κτίσις*, or creature, which in chap. v. 17 is employed as the instrument or way of God¹ for vengeance against His enemies, is here shown to be moulded and adapted by Him for the benefit of His children. Thus the raining down of the hail is contrasted with the raining down of the manna, and in both cases a substance which was naturally melted by heat is said to have resisted the heat: the hail because it was mixed with lightning, and the manna when it was made into cakes and baked. Water, which was an instrument of punishment to the Egyptians when their river became blood, was an instrument of mercy to the Israelites, when it was produced from the rock in the desert. Plagues were sent upon Egypt without relief, but when the dragons or 'seraphim' bit the Israelites a remedy was provided (*σύμβουλον*² *σωτηρίας*). The destruction of the firstborn is similarly contrasted with the plague in the desert, where the High Priest came and made an interval between the living and the dead, wearing the holy garments which, according to the ancient Jewish interpretation, were symbolical of the elements or the universe.

The seventeenth chapter is a remarkable one. It is possible that one point which was pressed against the Jews in the controversy was the absence of any description of the future punishment of the wicked in their Scriptures, or anything answering to the Tartarus of the Greek mythology. It seems that this chapter is written as a reply to this, dwelling at great length upon the horrors of a guilty conscience, and describing the Egyptian darkness as a taste of hell, with details partially borrowed from the pagan Styx, the Eumenides, and other vindictive powers. For it was an 'image of that darkness which should afterwards receive them.'

¹ ἐπλοποιήσει. *Cod. Sin.* ὁδοποιήσει.

² The Sinaitic text has *σύμβουλον* for *σύμβολον*.

The last chapter is a recapitulation of the preceding ones, with the addition of a comparison between Egypt and Sodom.

The notions about the plagues are such as would have hardly occurred to a writer in any country except Egypt. Philo, in the *Life of Moses*, dwells similarly on the strangeness of hail in Egypt, especially when it was mingled with fire. The earlier part of the book contains allusions to athletic contests, the wearing of garlands, and other Greek usages and ideas. The style of the book is unlike other Biblical Greek, and has more of a classical and profane element in it than any part of the Septuagint. In the latter part it is often obscure and involved. The comparison of the manna to ambrosia, and of the Egyptian darkness to Tartarus, suggests the inference that the author had some acquaintance with the poetry and mythology, as well as with the philosophy of the Greeks. These instances make it evident that the book belongs to a time when Greek erudition and eloquence had been appropriated by the Jews of Alexandria. (Brucker, in the *Miscell. Berlin*.)

It cannot be denied that 'The Book of Wisdom' has had a certain amount of influence upon the teaching of the Christian Church, not only in morals, but also in questions of doctrine. The estimation in which it was held in the Alexandrian Church may be inferred from the extensive use which was made of it by Clement, Origen, and Cyril. It furnished Clement with arguments corroborating his view of the Greek philosophy as a Divinely appointed instrument in preparing the world for Christ. In one place he repeats its language concerning the creative Spirit fashioning the unformed materials of the Universe: 'God alone is the Creator: for even if matter be the basis of all things, as philosophy teaches, such matter was without shape or fashion until God infused into it His pure and subtle energy.' (*Strom.* v. 14, 93.) He also uses chapter vi. and other parts of the book in support of his argument that God communicated His wisdom in a measure to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. The works of Origen show traces of its influence, both in his Commentaries and the books against Celsus. Thus the design of immortality for man at his creation, and the subsequent introduction of death, war, and homicide, through the envy of Satan, as asserted in chap. ii. 24, are subjects much dwelt upon by the Alexandrian and other Greek Fathers.

In the controversial treatises on the Trinity, the attributes of the Divine Wisdom are sometimes connected with the doctrine of the Person of the Son, and sometimes with that of the

Holy Spirit. The book was quoted to illustrate the doctrine of the giver of life, the vital energy that quickens all things.

The fourth chapter seems to have been used by Methodius and other early writers, in support of the argument for monastic institutions and the contemplative life.

The second chapter was employed, in the early controversies with the Jews, as a testimony to a suffering Messiah.

The third chapter was used as an encouragement to martyrdom, and also (in the Apostolical Constitutions) as an argument for Christian burial, and the sanctity of the tombs of the faithful.

The twelfth chapter, on the inherited guilt of the Canaanites, was quoted by S. Augustine in his controversy with the Pelagians.

From a passage in S. Agobardus, A.D. 810, it appears that chap. xv. 4 was used in the Iconoclastic controversy, or in some argument against the cultus of Saints.

In none of these doctrinal questions can 'The Book of Wisdom' be shown to have led the writers to depart from the teaching of the Canonical Scriptures; for such ideas as were derived through it from Platonism were held in subordination to the authority of the revealed Word, and in no sense substituted for it.

The heathenism by which Christianity was confronted, was for the most part grossly carnal and material; and Platonism would be regarded as the ally of the Gospel so far as it tended to elevate the mind above the pleasures of sense and earthly objects, and to lead it on to the contemplation of the spiritual nature of God. According to the teaching of the Alexandrian Church, the worship of God in spirit and in truth consisted in the apprehension of those spiritual truths, concerning Christ and His Church, of which the Levitical rites were types and symbols. This spiritual teaching, though less prominent in the ante-Nicene writings which are extant, than in the great authors of the fourth and fifth centuries, was no innovation of the later Fathers, but part of a continuous tradition from the Apostolic age. Christianity has ever had its points of contact with Platonism, as well as with the more material notions to which Judaism has clung. The Catholic Church uses ascetic and spiritual teaching as the necessary complement of external beauty in forms of worship, and the impressions which are conveyed through the senses;¹

¹ It is much to be regretted that the new Lectionary has so largely replaced the reading of the Sapiential Books, which the Church formerly employed so much in her Divine offices, by historical narratives which

considering that the ministry of the body, if it leads to an attachment to earthly and sensible objects, may be a hindrance instead of a help to the higher aspirations of the soul. The aim of the Church in her purest ages was to know Christ no more after the flesh, and to rise to the contemplation of His Deity. The unearthly and spiritual ideas which surround the doctrine of His eternal Godhead were the chief motives of the adoration paid to Him, and to these the benefits that flowed from His Manhood were secondary. For the dawn of the day of the Gospel was indicated in 'The Book of Wisdom' by the passing away of the trust in external worship and of the clinging to temporal promises, and the coming in of the better hope that was 'full of immortality.'

ART. IV.—THE ELIZABETHAN MARTYRS.

1. *Martyrs to the Catholic Faith: Memoirs of Missionary Priests and other Catholics of both sexes who suffered death in England on religious accounts, from the year 1577 to 1684.* New Edition. By BISHOP CHALLONER. (Edinburgh, 1878.)
2. *Calendar of English Martyrs, 1535-1681.* By THOMAS GRAVES LAW. (London, 1876.)
3. *Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers.* First, Second, and Third Series. By JOHN MORRIS. (London, 1873-77.)
4. *Life of Edmund Campion.* By RICHARD SIMPSON. (London, 1867.)
5. *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus.* Four Volumes. By HENRY FOLEY, S.J. (London, 1875-78.)

THE history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth yet remains to be written. A work like that of Mr. Froude is a melancholy instance of the abandonment of a golden opportunity and the prostitution of great powers to preconceived prejudices. The average Englishman, of average intelligence and of average education, who might sit down to a day or two's are less suggestive of devotion. Moral teaching of an ascetic kind may be wearisome to the earthly-minded, but the ancients perceived its value as a motive to prayer.

reading of the Domestic State Papers of Elizabeth's reign in the offices in Fetter Lane, could not fail to be utterly astonished at the nature of many of the documents to which he would find appended the names of Burleigh or Walsingham, or other well-known members of the Privy Council. In no particular would he receive so rude a shock, as in the knowledge thereby gained of the treatment of the Recusants, and of the Seminary and other priests. We cannot help longing for the coming of that oft-mentioned personage, 'the intelligent foreigner,' who, free from all national and religious prejudice, might be able to calmly digest all the great stores of the Public Record Office, as well as the numerous collateral but minor collections, such as the Talbot Papers of the College of Arms, or the Shrewsbury Papers of Lambeth Library, hitherto altogether neglected, or merely turned over in haste with a view to the grouping of picturesque incidents.

There is no fear that the martyrdoms of the reign of Mary will ever be under-estimated or forgotten. The laborious but heedless collections of John Foxe obtained a position in the country second only to the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, owing to the persistency with which the purchase of his folios was forced upon almost every parish in the kingdom, as part of the State policy; whilst the endless publication and republication of his *Acts and Monuments* by the Puritans of the present day, who seem to delight in the perpetuation of religious animosities, and who regard a penny edition of Foxe as a suitable reward for the infants of a Sunday school, will not permit the present generation to forget, if it were desirable, the terrible bitterness of those bloody times. To point out how utterly untrustworthy are a large proportion of Foxe's statements, would be a work of supererogation in the eyes of all scholars after the masterly exposure of Dr. Maitland; but when it is found how thoroughly Strype, Collier, and Burnet trust to documents professedly quoted by Foxe, instead of referring to the originals, and when it is also found that school histories of some repute, even now issuing from the press, are content to give what is only diluted Foxe by accepting the statements of the trio of Reformation historians just mentioned, it may be well to give the opinion of an unbiassed researcher into our public records, that has been deliberately affixed to the officially published Letters and Papers, *temp.* Henry VIII.:—'Had the Martyrologist,' says the late Professor Brewer, 'been an honest man, his carelessness and credulity would have incapacitated him from being a trustworthy historian. Unfortunately he was not honest. He

tampered with the documents that came to his hands, and freely indulged in those very faults of suppression for which he condemned his opponents.' In the Roman Catholic Sanders, the purveyor of many a baseless scandal of a prurient age, may be found a fitting rival of the Protestant Foxe; but with this important distinction, that no serious history has been based upon the writings of the former, whilst the works of the latter (in connection with the equally untrustworthy compilations of Bishop Ball) have been made the groundwork of professedly sober and learned treatises.

In thus once more pointing to the inaccuracies and wilful exaggerations of Foxe, we have no wish to lessen the enormity of the judicial murders for the cause of religion committed by Mary and her advisers; nor because we think it well to remember that neither Cranmer nor Calvin hesitated to enforce their own views of Christianity by the fire and fagot, does it follow that we are at all ready or disposed to find excuses for the greater severity in a like direction of the coarse Bonner. The more educated Roman Catholics have set an excellent example, in this respect, to Protestant and Anglican historians. They are ready to admit that it is a matter of *comparative* indifference whether the *bonâ fide* martyrs of the Marian persecution numbered three hundred, two hundred and fifty, or two hundred (the middle number is the nearest to the truth). Mr. Tierney says—

'As to the number and character of the sufferers, certain it is that no allowances can relieve the horror, no palliatives can remove the infamy, that must for ever attach to these proceedings. The amount of real victims is too great to be affected by any partial deductions. Were the catalogue limited to a few persons, we might pause to examine the merits of each individual case; but when, after the removal of every doubtful or objectionable name, a frightful list of not fewer than two hundred still remains, we can only turn with horror from the blood-stained page, and be thankful that such things have passed away.'—(Tierney's *Dodd*, vol. ii. p. 107.)

Nor do the Romanists grudge to give to those who died for their faith in Mary's days the title of martyr. Speaking of the death of Bishop Hooper, and three others, who perished at the stake in February 1555, Dr. Lingard says:—

'An equal constancy was displayed by all; and, though pardon was offered them at the last moment, they scorned to purchase the continuance of life by feigning an assent to doctrines which they did not believe. They were the protomartyrs of the Reformed Church of England.'

Lingard, too, vies with Tierney in expressing his horror at the number of persons who perished in the flames, during Mary's short reign, for their religious opinions; but he adds a paragraph in which he makes mention of some of the provocations given by the Reformers to Mary, 'if anything could be urged in extenuation of those cruelties:—

'They heaped on the Queen, her bishops, and her religion, every indecent epithet which language could supply. Her clergy could not exercise their functions without danger to their lives; a dagger was thrown at one priest in the pulpit, a gun was discharged at another; and several wounds were inflicted on a third while he administered the communion in his church. The chief supporters of the treason of Northumberland, the most active among the adherents of Wyatt, professed the Reformed creed; an impostor was suborned to personate Edward VI.; a pretended spirit published denunciations against the Queen from a hole in a wall; some congregations prayed for her death; tracts filled with libellous and treasonable matter were transmitted from the exiles in Germany; and successive insurrections were planned by the fugitives in France.'

It is no part of our contention to argue for the general fairness or freedom from prejudice of Lingard as an historian; but it can with confidence be asserted, by those at least who have made a study of our sixteenth-century history by the light of the additional information that has become available in the fifty years that have elapsed since Lingard first published his valuable *History of England*, that there is no truer sentence within the covers of the eight volumes of his work than the one which has just been quoted.

Englishmen, then, are all ready to admit, whatever their different religious predilections, that the reign of Mary was disgraced by a large number of legal murders, when men and women, otherwise good citizens, were put to cruel deaths for the tenacity with which they clung to the Reformed faith. The better-read Englishmen are also ready to admit that these numbers, disgracefully large as they are, have usually been exaggerated, and that out of those who used to be commonly reckoned as religious martyrs, a certain proportion suffered in reality for civil treason and other more prosaic crimes. But when November 17, 1558, the date of Elizabeth's accession, is reached, all this is changed. The vast majority of Englishmen until recently believed that from that date, when the Reformed Church obtained the upper hand of the Romanists, religious persecution of any severity ceased; and those who knew better, and professed to be the teachers of the people, were not ashamed (in the interests, as they conceived, of their

faith) to conceal the truth, and to foster the delusion. The greater accessibility of public documents, the printing of the calendars of the State Papers, and a growing love of accuracy, are all tending to slowly upset the ill-informed and prejudiced conclusions of past generations; but still the popular mind loves to make its nerves tingle with the cruelties of Bloody Mary, and to reflect with smug satisfaction on the Protestant purity and the general mildness of the reign of the good Queen Bess. And even many amongst those who find it impossible to deny the continued persecutions and the frequent employment of the hangman and executioner for those who clung to that which they pathetically termed 'the Old Religion,' try hard to convince themselves that all the Romanists who suffered death under Elizabeth suffered as traitors to her crown and to the realm, and not in any way as adherents to the faith of their fathers. If those who are inclined to thus argue would be content with maintaining that a certain number of those that perished were implicated in plots of Spanish origin, or would allow that a large proportion of those who died a most brutal death (when a word or two would have saved them) were martyrs to religious conviction, the student of history would have no serious quarrel with them. Nor would there be any disposition on our part to deny that Elizabeth and her council did receive considerable and frequent provocation to the courses they adopted; although it should not be forgotten that several of the minor plots have been proved to be infamous fabrications, like those of the Second Empire, which could always be coined whenever it was thought that public opinion required a spurt. But when those who should lead—we will not say public opinion, but the opinion of the Church—boldly assert that 'Elizabeth never put one single Romanist to death for his religion,' that those who suffered were all traitors and the perpetrators of 'ugly secular crimes' (we quote from the semi-official organ of an important Midland diocese for November 1878), and make other equally bold and unqualified statements of a like nature, it is time to protest against such a reading of history, lest the opponents of the Church of England should affect to believe that this is her settled opinion. Such an opinion might pass muster with intelligent men of the last generation, but those who have time to search into the original evidence of the reign of Elizabeth would blush to think that this should be held to be the opinion of the Anglican Church; and it is much to be hoped that before long, as truer views permeate, the Churchmen of England, in treating of the reign of Elizabeth, will vie with the better

Romanists in the candour with which they often speak of the short but cruel reign of her sister. Those who have come in contact with cultivated Roman Catholics, cannot fail to be aware of the bitterness engendered by the alleged inability of Anglicans to draw a fair estimate of the Elizabethan persecutions; and though this just stigma may, to some extent, be removed (now that we are able to point to the recently issued *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, by Dr. Augustus Jessopp, and to the casual remarks of one or two less important writers), the independent searching for evidence on these points, instead of the blind acceptance of the prejudiced writings of a bygone age, cannot be too strongly urged upon Churchmen at large. If those who have to discuss the perplexing religious topics of this reign, on the one side or the other, would only test for themselves the truth of statements they have been accustomed to heedlessly accept, we are convinced that one of the most important of the minor points of controversial acerbity between the two great branches of the Western Church would be materially lessened, and a vast hindrance to mutual understanding removed.

When Edmund Campion—after the clumsily forged evidence of the hastily forged plot had been given against him by renegades of the most abandoned character, like George Eliot—was asked what he could say why he should not die, he thus made reply to the Lord Chief Justice:—

‘The only thing that we now have to say is, that if our religion do make us traitors, we are worthy to be condemned; but otherwise are, and have been as true subjects as ever the Queen had. In condemning us you condemn all your own ancestors—all the ancient priests, bishops, and kings—all that was once the glory of England, the island of saints, and the most devoted child of the See of Peter. For what have we taught, however you may qualify it with the odious name of treason, that they did not uniformly teach? To be condemned with these old lights—not of England only, but of the world—by their degenerate descendants is both gladness and glory to us. God lives; posterity will live; their judgment is not so liable to corruption as that of those who are now going to sentence us to death.’

The whole account of the apprehension of Father Campion, of the skilful traps that were laid to ensnare him into treason, of the cruel tortures that he endured with the express sanction of Archbishop Whitgift, of the sudden changing of the indictment against him, of the suborning of witnesses to invent a preposterous plot, of the details of his trial and revolting sentence, of the kindness that he showed, even to ‘Judas’

Eliot, of the joyous steadfastness of his faith, and of the butchering scenes on the scaffold, is all told with a simple but effective earnestness by Mr. Simpson in his *Life of Edmund Campion*, and this account of his last days will bear the most minute testing. But the case of Campion—a stronger one so far as treason-evidence was concerned than scores who suffered a like death—has only now been mentioned on account of the telling argument and protest in his speech against sentence of death; it will scarcely be fair thus to leap more than twenty years into the midst of Elizabeth's reign without a word of introduction.

It has been asserted by Camden, and pretty generally accepted by most subsequent writers, that during the first fourteen years of Elizabeth's reign the Roman Catholics were left free in the private exercise of their religion through the prevalence of a system of almost official connivance. But no statement could well be more devoid of accuracy. The Act of Uniformity of the first year of her reign, supplemented by further legislation of the fifth year, provided that no temporal or spiritual office was to be held except by those who took an oath that the Queen was Supreme Head of the Church of England. Anyone refusing to take the oath was not only to be disabled from preferment or office, but to forfeit all his goods and lands to the crown, and to suffer perpetual imprisonment. For a second offence, or rather if he persisted three months in his refusal after the first tender of the oath, then he was to suffer death, &c., as is used in cases of high treason. But this Act did not apply, as is often argued, merely to the holders of spiritual benefices or temporal offices; it also provided that anyone, by word, deed, or act, affirming or defending the spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, should for the first offence lose all his goods, real and personal; for the second should undergo perpetual imprisonment; and for the third death, as for high treason. Moreover, all aiders or abettors of any such offenders were liable to the penalties of *præmunire*, and for the second offence were to be adjudged guilty of high treason. Any clergyman using any other rite or service-book otherwise than that of the Common Prayer was, for the first default, to be committed to prison for six months, for the second offence to suffer loss of his benefice and a year's imprisonment, and for the third to undergo perpetual imprisonment. Also, any layman refusing to come to church should pay 12*d.* for every Sunday and holiday wherein he faileth, and anyone present at any other service than that of the Common Prayer, was to

forfeit one hundred marks, for the second offence four hundred marks, and for the third perpetual imprisonment. True it is that Elizabeth did not feel strong enough, owing to the strenuous opposition of Convocation and the Universities, as well as to the fact that the adherents of the 'old religion' were in many parts a distinct majority, to thoroughly enforce any general obedience to the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy until 1579, in the twenty-first year of her reign; but there was not a shire in the country that did not immediately suffer from the persecution of the Romanists. In the then balance of religious parties it would have been a fatal blunder to resort to the punishment of death; and we will do Elizabeth the justice of believing that she was anxious to avoid resorting to the extreme penalty, not merely as a matter of policy but as one of feeling. But almost every persecution short of death was quickly resorted to, and the Recusants were everywhere harassed by fines, forfeitures, and imprisonment, in order to compel their attendance at church. Where the magistrates were lax in their efforts, special commissioners, armed with the fullest powers immediately from the crown—powers which, in their free use of torture, as well as in other respects, more closely resembled the Inquisition than anything hitherto established in England—visited the disaffected districts, or had the delinquents summoned before them in London.

Irrespective of the evidence that can be gleaned of the truth of this assertion from Strype's *Annals* and other printed sources, there is a mass of material that has not yet been published or analysed, showing the severity of the persecution, especially between 1561 and 1563. A letter from Edmund Grindal, then Bishop of London, addressed to Sir William Cecil, on July 12, 1563 (Lansd. MSS.), says:—

'Your second letter was for Sir Thomas Fitzherbert. He is a very stiff man. We had a solemn assembly of commissioners in the end of the term only for his case, where Mr. Chancellor of the Dutchy was present, and there concluded to let Mr. Fitzherbert be abroad upon sureties, if he would be bound in the meantime to go orderly to the church, without binding him to receive the communion. That Sir Thomas refused. We will have a new conference upon occasion of your letter, and consider the circumstances of his case, and after certify you of the same.'

A schedule to a State Paper, of the year 1561, signed by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Chester, as Commissioners of Recusants, shows that Sir Thomas Fitzherbert was then a prisoner in the Fleet 'by order from us,' together with Dr. Scot, the ejected Bishop of Chester; Dr. Harpsfield, ex-Arch-

deacon of London ; Thomas Wood, ex-Rector of High Ongar, Essex ; and Dr. Cole, ex-Dean of St. Paul's. Amongst the laymen then confined in other London prisons by the authority of the same commissioners, we find two Derbyshire neighbours of Sir Thomas, both of good family, viz. John Draycott, in the Counter, Poultry, and John Sacheverell, in the Counter, Wood Street. Several of the Elizabethan bishops were active agents in the suppression of recusancy, frequently acting as commissioners in their different districts, when they were furnished with the vaguest and most arbitrary powers. It is painful to have to admit that both Archbishop Grindal and Archbishop Whitgift were expressly in favour of the application of torture to Romanists, as can be proved in their own handwriting. If the bishops were sluggish in the work of reporting Recusants, a reminder speedily reached them from the Privy Council, and occasionally the Queen did not scorn to communicate with them directly through the agency of a ruffian like Topcliffe. Nor did they act as special commissioners only, but where it was doubtful if the country gentlemen were severe enough the bishops were directed to attend quarter sessions, so as to secure the due prosecution of the Romanists. We suppose they were placed specially on the Commission of the Peace for this purpose ; at all events we are not aware of their action as county magistrates at other times. As an instance of this, William Overton, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, presided at the sessions held at Derby on July 19, 1581, when several tenants of Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, and other yeomen of the county, were prosecuted for not having attended church for three months, and it comes out incidentally, in private letters from Richard Topcliffe to the Earl of Shrewsbury, that this was owing to a broadly expressed reminder sent to Overton direct from Elizabeth.

A brief glance at the treatment received by the Fitzherberts, a family of ancient lineage, and of large landed possessions in Derbyshire and Staffordshire, will serve as a sample of the tender mercies vouchsafed by Elizabeth's government to those who were obstinate in cleaving to the 'old religion,' especially if they were at the same time possessed of wealth. A return made by Thomas Bentham, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, to the Privy Council, of those in his diocese 'openly known not to come to church,' describes Sir Thomas Fitzherbert as 'A gentleman of great wealth and countenance as well in Staffordshire as in Derbieshire, and in myne owne Judgement no lesse worthe in

Landes and goodes of the yere than M markes.' And this return was made in 1577, after he had already suffered severely from fines, and from the barefaced robbery of his cattle (whilst he was in gaol), by agents of the Government. Sir Thomas was son and heir to that excellent man, Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, of Norbury, the well-known judge and legal writer. He was imprisoned by the commissioners in 1561, and for thirty years, with only three brief intervals of freedom, was he dragged about from gaol to gaol, now in the Fleet, now in the county gaol at Derby, now at Lambeth, and now in the Tower, in which state prison he finally died in 1591, at the age of 74. No means were neglected to try and secure his conviction for offences that were termed treason, but though accused of complicity in several alleged plots, nothing could ever be proved against him except his non-attendance at church. So loyal was he to Elizabeth in matters temporal, that, notwithstanding the heavy and repeated fines to which he had been subjected, he volunteered to supply double the contribution demanded of his estate on the approach of the Spanish Armada. It will be within the mark to say that he was deprived of two-thirds of his estates. By his marriage with Anne, daughter and heiress of Sir Arthur Eyre, he came into possession of the valuable manor of Padley, in North Derbyshire. Having no children, and almost all of his Elizabethan life being spent in bonds, his next brother, John Fitzherbert, resided at the mansion house of Padley, and received the rents. On Candlemas Day, 1587, this house was searched for priests; two were found concealed, Nicholas Garlick and Robert Ludlam. These priests, and John Fitzherbert, were taken to Derby gaol. On July 25, 1588, Garlick and Ludlam (together with a third priest seized elsewhere) were hanged, drawn, and quartered, and their heads and quarters fixed on poles in prominent places about the county towns, solely for the crime of being Roman priests; whilst John Fitzherbert was confined at Derby and in other prisons for the rest of his life, finally dying of gaol fever. Richard Fitzherbert, the next brother of Sir Thomas, resided at the principal seat of the family, at Norbury. When his brother was first imprisoned by the episcopal commissioners, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, Richard escaped to the Continent, and was formally outlawed. On matters becoming rather quieter, Richard Fitzherbert returned to Norbury, and lived for a brief time peaceably in that retired village. But the spies reported his return, and the Privy Council, not trusting the Earl of Shrewsbury, the lord-lieutenant of the

county, despatched one Thorne, a notorious pursuivant of the roughest character, to effect his capture.

'Thorne practising to apprehend Mr. Richard Fitzherbert used this policy. To Norbury, where he knew this gentleman lay, came three lame supposed beggars, one man, two women, among divers others that there had alms, and when all were served as accustomed, these three continued still crying and craving more alms, as seeming more needy. The good gentleman going down himself at their pitiful cry to give them some money, the man beggar arrested him, laying hands on him to carry him to an officer, and threw the gentleman down. With this noise his friends within came out to rescue him. The beggar seeing that, having a dagg (pistol) ready charged at his girdle, offered to discharge it at Mr. Fitzherbert's breast, but it went not off. Thereupon the beggar, beaten, let fall his dagg and went a little way off, where Thorne expected his return with hope of prey. The dagg, then taken up by one of that house, went off itself without hurting anybody, albeit there were many present.'¹

Thorne sent his version of this affair to the Privy Council, and soon after Richard Fitzherbert was apprehended by a strong body of armed men, and placed in prison, where he remained for several years, and we believe died. Two of Richard's three sons were also imprisoned in Staffordshire for recusancy.

William Fitzherbert, the remaining brother of Sir Thomas, married Elizabeth, daughter and co-heiress of Humphrey Swinnerton, of Swinnerton, from whom are descended the Fitzherberts, who now own that property. William happily died in the year of Elizabeth's accession, and thus escaped persecution, but his daughter and two sons were all at different times in prison. His eldest son, Thomas, who was in gaol in 1572, after his wife's death became a Jesuit father; he was a well-known controversial writer, and died at Rome in 1640, at the age of 88.

The three sisters of Sir Thomas Fitzherbert were Elizabeth, Dorothy, and Catharine, who were respectively married to William Bassett, of Langley, Ralph Longford, of Longford, and John Sacheverell, of Morley, all of them gentlemen of distinguished ancestry and considerable property in the county of Derby. All these were repeatedly and heavily fined,

¹ Morris' *Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers*, 3rd series. This is a quotation from the MSS. of Father Christopher Green, English Penitentiary at St. Peter's at Rome, where he died in 1697. He made large collections for a history of the Elizabethan martyrs. A considerable part of his MSS. have been printed by Mr. Foley; so far as we have tested them, they are remarkably accurate. The narrative given in the text, is distinctly corroborated both by the State Papers and the Talbot Letters.

Bassett and Sacheverell also enduring long terms of imprisonment, whilst two of the ladies were given into the private custody of staunch conformists in the county, and compelled to pay for their own maintenance in those families.

Returning to Candlemas Day, 1587, we find that though John Fitzherbert was not in the house at Padley at the time of the apprehension of the priests, Anthony, his seventh son, was present. Anthony was, therefore, also taken to Derby gaol, where he was dangerously ill, and after a year or two's detention set at liberty, but only to be again apprehended when in London. As to the other children of John Fitzherbert, the two eldest sons died in their youth, the fourth, fifth, and sixth sons entered into Holy Orders in the Church of Rome, and Thomas, the third son, played the noble part of betraying his aged grandfather, Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, and securing his final imprisonment. The husbands of three of the five daughters of John Fitzherbert—viz., Thomas Draycott, Thomas Barlow, and Thomas Eyre, all suffered fines and imprisonment for simple recusancy. Maud, the wife of Thomas Barlow, was also imprisoned in Derby gaol for several years, and her sister Jane Eyre was given into the private custody of a parson in the south of the shire. An old MS. pedigree of the Eyre family, and another independent MS. *temp.* James I., both of which we have seen, establish the following extra piece of villany in the case of poor John Fitzherbert. He was condemned to death for harbouring priests, and the estates of Padley were confiscated for a like reason; but it was intimated that his life might be saved if the then enormous sum of 10,000*l.* could be raised. His son-in-law, Thomas Eyre, of Holme Hall, sold his manor of Whittington, and, with the help of others, gathered together the whole sum. It is said that it was also stipulated that John Fitzherbert should be set at liberty, but, as this was a secret transaction, the recipients of the money could not be brought to task, and he died in prison.

Thomas Fitzherbert was duped into conforming to the Church of England, and into the betrayal of his grandfather and other of his relatives and former friends, by the wiles and instigation of that prince of villains, and favourite tool of the Privy Council, Richard Topcliffe. Topcliffe persuaded young Thomas that if he would turn informer, his influence would be sufficient to procure for him the Padley and other forfeited estates. Shortly before his death in the Tower, Sir Thomas Fitzherbert made a will, by which he disinherited his grandson Thomas; but Topcliffe was on the look-out, obtained

speedy access to his cell, found the will, and carried it off to Archbishop Whitgift, and with his sanction it was destroyed. Thomas thus by fraud inherited that which remained of the Norbury and other unforfeited lands; but it is satisfactory to find that, after prolonged litigation, he did not succeed to the valuable manor of Padley—which actually fell for a time into the hands of Topcliffe—and the brief remainder of his life was full of misery and crime. It is even more satisfactory to learn that Topcliffe also reaped no advantage from Padley, which was taken from him just when he was meditating there ending the last days of his active, but ever evil pilgrimage.

Dr. Jessopp, in pointing to the connection of Topcliffe with the persecution of the Norfolk recusants, has justly said: 'I cannot bring myself to dwell very much upon him, and I am reserving myself for an article upon him and his misdeeds, when some learned doctor of philosophy shall undertake to edit a Biographical Dictionary of Rogues and Murderers: then I shall be ready for the task of writing the masterpiece in the volume.' His awful cruelty to Father Southwell, and other victims who were handed over to him to torture as he pleased, the seduction (if not worse) of the daughter of one of his important prisoners, and the forcing her to turn informer against her own kindred, these and other sickening crimes have already been placed on record against him; but we doubt if the infamous nature of his transactions against the Fitzherberts is not the crowning point of Topcliffe's iniquity. There was no depth of degradation to which the man could not stoop, as is shown by the wholesale accusation of unnatural crimes that he preferred against certain tenants of the Earl of Shrewsbury who were holding Padley, and keeping him out of that which he affected to regard as his own. The ruins of Padley, and the chapel attached to the manor-house, still remain; but it was never tenanted for more than a few months after the legal murder of the priests in 1588; it has changed hands with strange rapidity, and a curse seems to cleave to the spot. For cringing cant and fawning hypocrisy, Topcliffe had few equals, as may be judged from letters of his still extant; for, cruel as he was to his victims, no one could be more subservient to wealth and power. He professed himself to be a strong Puritan, and used his influence to put in a word from time to time in favour of the 'silenced ministers.' It may be asked why, in this brief Elizabethan sketch, even a paragraph has been spent upon so unsavoury a customer. But it is of real importance, as showing the character of the confidential agents of the Government in their dealings with the recusants.

Richard Topcliffe, of Somerby, Lincolnshire, was of excellent family, and was specially proud of his sixteen-quartered coat. This placed him far above the ordinary run of priest-hunters or pursuivants. He was on terms of intimacy and friendship with several of the Privy Council, and had no difficulty in obtaining private interviews with the Queen, and receiving instructions immediately from her. Among the State Papers is a rough copy of Topcliffe's pedigree, in his friend Burleigh's own hand; and the emblazoned genealogy of Topcliffe was one of those with which the Lord Treasurer decorated the cloisters of Theobalds in conjunction with the highest of the land. The close connection of a man of this character and calibre with the Government of the day is one of the saddest and most humiliating features of the inner life of the court of Elizabeth. Such an intimacy is, however, after all, well worthy of a Council who could actually coolly endorse the letter of a traitor priest, offering to murder a co-religionist specially obnoxious to the Government with a poisoned Host, and who could continue to correspond with such a miscreant, and to act upon his information.¹

Nor did the persecution of the Fitzherberts extend merely to the members of the family. The laws were strained to the utmost with respect to their tenants, and when the ordinary laws could go no further, the arbitrary powers of commissioners, or powers specially delegated to pursuivants of the Privy Council, were brought into play against them. Several of their Staffordshire tenants died in the gaol of that county; whilst the Derby gaol, a specially pestilential place, built over the town sewer, and subject to constant epidemics of 'gaol fever,' proved fatal to many of their tenants of that shire. From the Talbot Papers, in the College of Arms, we take the following letter from the Privy Council to the Earl of Shrewsbury:—

'We have been thoroughly acquainted with the great care and diligence your Lordship hath used in the apprehension of Richard Fitzherbert, Martin Audley, Richard Twiford, and the rest, and do yeeld you very hearty thanks for the same. And likewise do pray your Lordship that by vertue of your Lieutenancie you authorize Edward Thorne (with such assistance of your Lordship's servants or others as you shall think fitte) to apprehend one Alice Rolston, keeper of Sir Thomas Fitzherbert's house at Norbury, and also one Thomas Coxson, keeper of the said Sir Thomas his Parke at Ridway, and such other persons from time to time as the said Thorne shall give

¹ *Dom. State Papers*, Eliz. 251, No. 49; the letter is addressed to Sir Robert Cecil, Burleigh's son, the Secretary to the Council.

notice of unto your Lordship, and as in your great discretion shalbe thought fit: to dispose of the said two persons so to be apprehended according to such instructions as in that behalf the said Thorne hath received from us. And so not doubting of your Lordship's performance hereof, we comit your good Lordship to the sauf protection of God. From the cort at Windsor this xxi September 1590.

'(Signed) C. Howard, Burleigh, Hatton, Hunsdon, Knollys, Wolley, Fortescue, Heneage.'

The confidence expressed by my Lords, of the Earl's eagerness to fulfil their behests, must be accepted for what it is worth, when it is found that at this very time they were in receipt of voluminous reports of the Earl's supposed complicity with certain recusants of his shire, and of the 'notorious Papists' who formed part of his household. A long list of his intimate friends, that was forwarded to the Council in January 1591 includes—

'Sir Charles Cavendishe, his brother-in-lawe, whooe in all likelihood is a close Papist, his first wyffe was the daughter of Sir Thomas Kitson, and she a Papist by birth and so continewd till her death, his second wyffe y^t nowe is thought to be no better than the first, himselfe verry polittique and beareth great swaye with my Lord at this daye.'¹

The system of espionage and spying upon spies was carried out with extraordinary minuteness, descending even to the pettiest details of daily life, and again reminding us of the worst phases of the Second Empire.

The giving of this brief outline of the treatment to which a single family was subjected, has carried us some way beyond the early anti-Roman legislation of Elizabeth. Enough, however, has been said of those early years to show that the notion of any systematic connivance at Roman worship is a mere fond imagination of those who would construct history in accordance with preconceived theories.

On the morning of May 15, 1570, the celebrated Bull of Pope Pius V., excommunicating the Queen, and depriving her 'of all and every dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever,' was found nailed to the palace door of the Bishop of London. This insolent threat was of course a declaration of war on the part of Rome; but it is only fair to say that the Pope, who weakly vacillated for a long period before he launched his thunderbolt, would probably have kept this weapon in his

¹ The greater part of the Derbyshire incidents in this article, especially those relative to the Fitzherbert family, have not hitherto been published. It has been announced that a Derbyshire clergyman and another gentleman are preparing a work on the Troubles of the Fitzherberts.

armoury, had the 'systematic connivance' been an historical fact. It was provoked by severity and not by clemency. But the Papal thunderbolt recoiled upon its forger; it naturally provoked a spirit of retaliation on the part of those against whom it was directed, and it became practically a dead letter with the English Roman Catholics, excepting a mere handful of bigots. One or two sacrificed their lives in publishing and asserting it; but the bolt, instead of lighting in the midst of the gunpowder of an inflammable political party, eager to plunge their country into reckless bloodshed (as had been fondly imagined by a few violent spirits who had the ear of the Pontiff), dropped into the ranks of those who, whilst resolutely devoted to the 'old religion,' were keen lovers of their country, and was quenched in the very earnestness and piety of their convictions, after the brief hissing and spluttering of its first contact had passed away. But though the Bull was thus disregarded and frequently repudiated by the Roman Catholics in England, and contemptuously treated as null and void by the neighbouring princes and potentates, its effect on Elizabeth's Government was to produce a fresh crop of penal laws of increased severity. The statute of the 13th of Elizabeth provides, *inter alia*, that after July 1, 1571, any person within the realm of England, or the dominions thereof, willingly receiving absolution or reconciliation from any Roman priest, shall suffer the penalties of high treason; and that anyone bringing into England any Agnus Dei, crosses, pictures, beads, or any such like, or wearing or using the same, shall incur the penalties of *præmunire*, i.e. loss of all lands and goods, and perpetual imprisonment.

Many of the recusants, finding the vigilance with which the new law was carried out (there were many imprisonments for the crime of wearing beads, &c.—'lewd trash,' as it was usually termed by the pursuivants), sought means to go into voluntary banishment beyond the seas. But another new law was devised in the following year, on purpose to prevent them, and to recall those who had already escaped to the mercies of paternal rule; enacting that all persons who had left the realm since the *first* day of the reign of Elizabeth, except under licence of the Great or Privy Seal, should return within six months, or forfeit to the Queen the whole of their property; and that any conveyances, leases, gifts, &c., of their lands or goods should be null and void.

In 1574 a small band of four newly-ordained priests, educated at the recently-established college at Douay, crossed over into England. It is necessary to remark that they were

Englishmen, who had left for a time their own shores on purpose to obtain ordination. This is true of ninety-nine per cent. of the seminary priests, and must obviously have been the case, even if we knew not the names and lineage of all of them from the Douay Diaries now in course of publication ; but popular histories have not been ashamed to misrepresent the whole of this movement by speaking of them as foreigners. Even Dr. Hook, in his *Lives of the Archbishops*, writes of 'a very distinguished Englishman' being at their head ; thereby implying, we hope unwittingly, that they were for the most part of foreign blood. In June 1577, the High Sheriff, in conjunction with the Bishop's Chancellor, apprehended one Cuthbert Mayne—a fellow of S. John's, Cambridge, who had been ordained at Douay—at a private house in the neighbourhood of Truro. He was cruelly imprisoned at Launceston, 'being chained to his bed-posts with a pair of great gyves about his legs, and strict commandment given that no man should repair unto him.' At the Michaelmas Assizes, the chief charge against him was a denial of the Queen's supremacy ; but no sufficient proof being forthcoming, Judge Manhood directed the jury to find him guilty, alleging 'that where plain proofs were wanting, strong presumptions ought to take their place.' After sentence his life was offered him if he would renounce his religion, and, on refusal, he was assured that he should not suffer if he would simply swear upon the Bible that the Queen was the supreme head of the Church of England. Eventually, on November 29, he was drawn, hanged, and quartered, being the protomartyr of the seminary priests. Mr. Tregian, at whose house Cuthbert Mayne was captured, lost all his property, and was imprisoned for life ; and the same fate befell five Cornish gentlemen and three yeomen who were neighbours or servants to Mr. Tregian.

In the following year another priest and a layman were executed for denying the Queen's spiritual supremacy, the latter being previously racked and otherwise foully tortured in the Tower, in an endeavour to make him reveal where he had heard Mass. In 1580, Fathers Campion and Parsons, the Jesuits, came into England. As a counter-mine to this new incursion, the Act of 23 Elizabeth was passed, whereby the penalty of high treason against both confessor and penitent, in case of absolution given by a Roman priest, was extended and confirmed, and all those knowing of any absolution or reconciliation, and failing to acquaint the authorities within twenty days, were guilty of misprision of treason. In the same Parliament, the penalty for recusancy of 12*d.* a Sunday,

was raised to 20*l.* for every month, and the recusant had also to find sureties for 200*l.* to be conformable in the future. The Recusant Rolls in the Public Record Office (which seem to have escaped the attention of almost all writers on this subject) prove the thoroughness with which these heavy fines were in most shires enforced. Where the fines were not paid, under a certain scale of regulations, the recusants were placed in gaol; and when they fled the country, or even concealed themselves, their whole estates were seized. For half a century these fines formed an important part of the national revenues, though the lion's share was squandered on informers and agents. The wealthy recusants were naturally selected as the better prey; but it has to be said for these laws, that they were in many parts carried out regardless of class. Turning over the Rolls for a single year, we find the penalties exacted of tailors, carpenters, shoemakers, farriers, herdsman, and labourers.

In 1581 occurred the martyrdom of Father Campion, as already detailed, and with respect to this it may be well to give the unnecessarily qualified words of Hallam:—

‘Nothing that I have read affords the slightest proof of Campion’s concern in treasonable practices, though his connections and profession as a Jesuit render it by no means unlikely. If we may confide in the published trial, the prosecution was as unfairly conducted, and supported by as slender evidence, as any, perhaps, which can be found in our books.’

Four priests in all were executed that year. The odious and excessive use of torture to Father Campion and two of his fellow priests becoming tolerably well known, no small outcry was raised about it, both at home and abroad, several pamphlets being secretly circulated about the general treatment by Elizabeth of her Roman Catholic subjects. To these no less a pen than Lord Burleigh’s replied in two short treatises, the one entitled, *The Execution of Justice in England for Maintenance of Public and Private Peace*, and the other, *A Declaration of the favourable dealing of Her Majesty’s Commissioners appointed for the examination of certain Traitors, and of Tortures unjustly reported to be done upon them for matter of Religion*. Of the last of these productions, it will be sufficient to quote Hallam’s verdict:—‘Those who reverence the memory of Lord Burleigh must blush for this pitiful apology;’ and again—‘Such miserable excuses serve only to mingle contempt with our detestation.’ Hallam’s succeeding paragraph, in which he praises Elizabeth for ordering torture in the future to be disused, is unworthy of

his usual discrimination as an historian. If Elizabeth ever did issue such orders, she took no care to see that they were obeyed, and her agents set her orders at defiance. A few years later we know that she was cognisant of some of the disgusting tortures inflicted by Topcliffe. Of the first of Burleigh's pamphlets, contending that no one had been indicted for treason save such as obstinately maintained the Bull depriving the Queen of her crown, and that a vast number of Roman Catholics (specially mentioning the deprived bishops) had lived unmolested on the score of their faith, because they paid due temporal allegiance, &c., &c., all that we can say is—and it is said with the greatest deliberation—that a more outrageously false document was never issued by a responsible minister of the English Crown. There is scarcely a single clause which cannot be proved to be black with falsehood. The Romanists have erred on the side of mildness in writing about it. This precious treatise, though translated into one or two foreign tongues, seems to have had but a very limited circulation. It was probably chiefly drawn up for distribution by our ambassadors among the Continental courts, for such barefaced lies as several of its statements contain could scarcely be swallowed by any at home.

In 1582 eleven priests were executed, all but three of them, who were executed at York, having been first severely tortured. In 1583 two priests and two laymen suffered death for their religion, and in the following year many others, both priests and laymen, for a like cause, though according to the statute it was termed high treason.

In 1584 a yet severer Act was passed, declaring it high treason for any priest ordained abroad to be even found in the kingdom; and anyone receiving, relieving, or comforting such a priest was to be considered a felon and to suffer death. But the increased persecution only stimulated the ardour of the English students at Douay College (now removed to Rheims). The Douay Diaries show nine out of the thirty priests sent to England in 1584 as marked with the fatal letter M, betokening their martyrdom; and next year ten out of twenty-four obtained the like honour. 'Yet the stream of missionaries did not slacken. The report of each fresh martyrdom was celebrated at the college by a Mass of thanksgiving and a solemn *Te Deum*, and only served to stimulate the zeal and fervour of those who were longing to share the same labours and win the same crown.'

Mr. Green, in his popular *Short History of the English People*, has in some measure recognised the severity of the

Elizabethan persecution, and has characterised it in more just language than has been the wont of his predecessors. But the remarkable inaccuracy that seems to beset every one who has dealt with this subject has betrayed Mr. Green into several considerable errors (to use a mild term), that have been pointed out with much courtesy and forbearance in the preface to the new edition of *Challoner's Martyrs*. When writing of the Act of 1581, which declared all absolving or reconciling others to the See of Rome, or those willing to be so absolved or reconciled, guilty of high treason, Mr. Green remarks: 'No layman was brought to the bar or to the block under its provisions. The oppression of the Catholic gentry was limited to an exaction, more or less rigorous at different times, of fines for recusancy or non-attendance at public worship. *The work of bloodshed was reserved wholly for priests.*' It is enough to make one despair of ever attaining to accuracy in general history, when such a statement as this is put forth, on authority to which so much credit has been deservedly in most matters adjudged. The truth is that only two years of the last twenty of Elizabeth's reign were unsoiled by laymen's blood, who suffered either under the 1581 statute or under the 1584 statute for the yet milder offence of giving lodging or even an hour's shelter to a hunted priest. In 1596, about the only year when no priest was executed, four gentlemen, imprisoned for their faith in York Castle, were put to death, for the sole offence of having attempted the conversion to the 'old religion' of a Protestant minister, a fellow prisoner, who had expressed a desire to that effect. The minister afterwards treacherously accused them of this dire crime, which they did not attempt to deny, and were in consequence executed for *high treason*! Other laymen suffered death for being themselves absolved or reconciled to the Roman Church; others for denying the Queen's supremacy; some for importing Roman books; and several for giving food and shelter to priests. One gentleman was actually executed for procuring a dispensation from Rome to marry his second-cousin. Mr. Morris records an instance of a tailor of Smithfield who was tortured and hanged on no other evidence but that he had made a coat for a priest; and that on another occasion two lay gentlemen were executed, one for giving a priest a quart of wine, the other a supper.

Mr. Hallam says in his *History of the English Constitution* that no woman, so far as he remembered, was put to death in Elizabeth's persecution. But his memory, like that of Mr. Green, played him false in this particular. In 1586 one Margaret Ward was condemned to death for

assisting a priest to escape from Bridewell. She was offered her liberty if she would go to church, and on refusing was hanged at Tyburn. In 1601 Mrs. Ann Line, an aged and infirm widow gentlewoman, was tried before Chief Justice Popham for entertaining a priest, and being convicted was hanged at Tyburn; one account, which we try not to believe, says that she was flogged previous to the execution. Mrs. Wells, for the same cause, received sentence of death, but died in prison. Anne Tesse and Bridget Maskew were condemned to be burnt alive, but, after lingering for some time in gaol, were set at liberty on the accession of James I. But the saddest case was that of Mrs. Margaret Clitheroe, of good Yorkshire family, her maiden name being Middleton, who, on March 26, 1586, was *pressed to death* at York, on a charge of harbouring and relieving priests. The following graphic account of this terrible scene, as given in the third series of *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, is from the contemporary narrative of her director, who was present throughout:—

‘About eight of the clock the sheriffs came to her, and she being ready expecting them, having trimmed up her head with new inkle, and carrying on her arm the new habit of linen with inkle strings, which she had prepared to bind her hands, went cheerfully to her marriage; as she called it, dealing her alms in the street, which was so full of people that she could scarce pass by them. She went barefoot and barelegged, her gown loose about her. Fawcet, the sheriff, made haste, and said, “Come away, Mrs. Clitheroe.” The martyr answered merrily, “Good Master Sheriff, let me deal my poor alms before I now go, for my time is but short.” They marvelled all to see her joyful countenance.

‘The place of execution was the Tolbooth, six or seven yards’ distance from the prison. There were present at her martyrdom the two Sheriffs of York, Fawcet and Gibson; Frost, a minister; Fox, Mr. Cheeke’s kinsman, with another of his men, the four sergeants which had hired certain beggars to do the murther, three or four men, and four women.

‘The martyr coming to the place, kneeled her down, and prayed to herself. The tormentors bade her pray with them, and they would pray with her. The martyr denied, and said, “I will not pray with you, and you shall not pray with me; neither will I say Amen to your prayers, nor shall you to mine.” Then they all willed her to pray for the Queen’s Majesty. The martyr began in this order: First, in the hearing of them all, she prayed for the Catholic Church, then for the Pope’s Holiness, Cardinals, and other Fathers which have charge of souls, and then for all Christian princes. At which words the tormentors interrupted her, and willed her not to put her Majesty among that company; yet the martyr proceeded in this order: “And especially for Elizabeth, Queen of England, that God

move her to the Catholic faith, and that after this mortal life she may receive the blessed joys of heaven ; for I wish as much good," quoth she, "to her Majesty's soul as to mine own." Sheriff Gibson, abhorring the cruel fact, stood weeping at the door. Then said Fawcet, "Mrs. Clitheroe, you must remember and confess that you die for treason." The martyr answered, "No, no, Mr. Sheriff ; I die for the love of my Lord Jesu ;" which last words she spake with a loud voice. Then Fawcet commanded her to put off her apparel, "For you must die," said he, "naked, as judgment was given and pronounced against you" . . .

'The women took off her clothes, and put upon her the long habit of linen. Then very quietly she laid her down upon the ground, her face covered with a handkerchief, the linen habit being placed over her as far as it could reach, all the rest of her body being naked. The door was laid upon her, her hands she joined towards her face. Then the sheriff said, "Nay, you must have your hands bound." The martyr put forth her hands over the door still joined. Then two sergeants parted them, and with the inkle strings which she had prepared for that purpose, bound them to two posts, so that her body and her arms made a perfect cross. They willed her again to ask the Queen's Majesty's forgiveness, and to pray for her. The martyr said she had prayed for her. They also willed her to ask her husband's forgiveness. The martyr said, "If ever I have offended him, but for my conscience, I ask him forgiveness."

'After this they laid weight upon her, which, when she first felt, she said, "Jesu ! Jesu ! Jesu ! have mercy upon me !" which were the last words which she was heard to speak.

'She was in dying one quarter of an hour. A sharp stone, as much as a man's fist, was put under her back ; upon her was laid a quantity of seven or eight hundredweight at the least, which breaking her ribs, caused them to burst forth of the skin.

'Thus most gloriously this gracious martyr overcame all her enemies, passing (from) this mortal life with marvellous triumph into the peaceable city of God, there to receive a worthy crown of endless immortality and joy.'

The steadfast and unshaken adherence of the great bulk of the Roman Catholics to the country of their birth, notwithstanding the bitterness with which they were persecuted, is most remarkably illustrated by their conduct in 1588, and ought in itself to be a sufficient answer to those who persist in raising the cuckoo cry of 'traitor' over the agonised deaths of those who perished for their religion. In 1588 'the sacred expedition,' which had been so long in preparing, set sail and was destroyed. Every one of the predictions of Dr. Allen—and of that small knot of violent men who thought an alliance with a foreign power quite justifiable, in order to get rid of her whom they regarded as the chief persecutor of their faith—as to what would take place on the arrival of the Armada,

were falsified by the event. A letter from one of Allen's own priests to Mendoza, which has been translated in the *Harleian Miscellany*, shows 'how each of the noblemen and gentlemen whom Allen guessed would be foremost in welcoming the invader was eager to defy and do battle with him; how the very priests, upon whose action Allen counted most securely, turned patriots in that emergency of their country; and, in a word, how both Catholics and Protestants had been deceived in what they all expected Catholics to do. Then it was seen that, if Catholics would die for their religion, they would die for their country also, even though the invading force came with the sanction and blessing of the Pope, and though its great object was the restoration of their religion.'¹ Hallam has the courage to pronounce a well-earned panegyric on the conduct of the Roman Catholics in the hour of their country's need; and he points out how in every county they rallied to the standard of the Lord-Lieutenant, imploring that they might not be suspected of bartering the national independence even for their religion itself; and then he adds, with a justice which must come home to every unprejudiced mind, 'It would have been a sign of gratitude if the laws depriving them of the free exercise of their religion had been, if not repealed, yet allowed to sleep, after these proofs of loyalty. But the execution of priests and of other Catholics became, on the contrary, more frequent, and the fines for recusancy were exacted as rigorously as before.' This is indeed only too true, for in the last six months of 1588 the number of martyrs for their religion amounts at least to thirty-one, of whom twenty-one were priests.

Another very usual misconception (into which Mr. Green has partially fallen) with regard to the Elizabethan persecution deserves a word of correction. It has been pretty generally assumed that the English mission was a scheme of the Jesuits; and that all, or at all events the great majority, of the missionaries and martyrs belonged to that order. But this is the very opposite of the truth; and it is worth contradicting, because the average British mind yet clings to the fable which sees a conspirator in every Jesuit. Of the grave injustice (though based on a certain modicum of truth) done to the

¹ Mr. Simpson, from whose *Life of Campion* this passage is quoted, makes just ridicule of the puerile reasonings and expectations of Allen in looking for any other result. At the same time he boldly avows that 'Allen had as much right to invoke foreign aid in 1581 as the French exiles of 1793, or the Confederates of the Southern States in 1863. The government of Elizabeth was such that any Catholic who could destroy it had every right to make the attempt.'

Society of Jesus by this current notion, it would be foreign to our purpose to here say a word, but the other can be at once refuted. From 1555 to 1580, although sixty-nine Englishmen had joined the society, not one came to England; but the first missionaries landed in 1574, and the first martyrdom of a priest occurred in 1577. The English College of the Jesuits at Rome was commenced in 1576; an ancient hospital there, founded in the fourteenth century, and endowed with a rental of 2,000 ducats for the entertainment of English pilgrims, being given to the Society by Gregory XII. for that purpose. It was from this college that Fathers Campion and Parsons set forth on April 18, 1580; and that was the first step of the Jesuits towards England. During the reign of Elizabeth, the Jesuits were but a mere handful as compared with the numbers of the secular Roman clergy. In 1596, when a hundred of the seminary missionaries had suffered death and another hundred had been banished, only four Jesuits had been executed, and there were but sixteen priests of the society then in England. Afterwards a far larger share of the work fell to the Jesuits, and those who are interested in the subject are referred to the *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, by Henry Foley, S.J. Four volumes have been already issued, and a fifth, now in the press, will complete the work and bring it down to their last English martyrs, at the time of the Titus Oates plot. These volumes, and they have been tested pretty severely and frequently, are quite worthy of their secondary title, *Historic Facts illustrative of the Labours and Sufferings of its Members in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. They pretend to no graces of literary style, and the arrangement of matter might have been considerably improved, but the closely printed pages are a monument of industry, the references to all the manuscripts and authorities quoted appear to be scrupulously correct, and they cannot fail to prove invaluable to the historian of the future. The remarks or individual conclusions of the author are sparingly given; with many of them the reader, who is neither a Jesuit nor a Roman Catholic, will be disposed to quarrel; but every Catholic can find in his pages many a record of a holy life, in no sense controversial, that can be read with the deepest interest and to the greatest profit.

The number of executions for religion in the reign of Elizabeth, like that in the time of Mary, has been variously estimated. Dodd reckons it at 191; Milner at 204. But Bishop Challoner's *Martyrology* (originally published in 1741), which

is a most carefully compiled book, puts it somewhat lower. He rigidly excludes from his list all who, in his opinion, can be said in any way to have suffered on political grounds. John Felton, who fixed the Bull of Pius V. on the Bishop of London's gates, is omitted, as also various other names, including two Marian priests, that are met with in some martyrologies. The sober nature of his whole work, and the trustworthy character of the contemporary and other documents from which he quotes, are beyond gainsaying. The many aliases often adopted by the missionaries for the sake of safety may have betrayed him into one or two reduplications, but it seems as if Dr. Challoner had rather erred on the side of under- than overstating his case.¹

After a very careful comparison of different lists and authorities, the following seem to be soundly established cases of Roman Catholics suffering a violent death for their religion during the reign of Elizabeth :—

Priests	127
Laymen	53
Women	3
Total						183

Everyone of these could certainly have escaped death if they had been content to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of Elizabeth ; and we know that in many, probably a majority, of instances death might have been avoided by attendance at the parish church, without any verbal declaration.

Nor should those who died in bonds, and who are in reality equally entitled to the honour of martyrdom with those in the previous list, be forgotten. Mr. Foley gives a long list of men and women who perished in English prisons for their religion, about 130 of them being of the reign of Elizabeth. But it is an imperfect list, and a closer study of the papers at the Record Office, and other documents of the period, would materially increase the number.

It is pitiful to look at the arguments to which those who contend that all these priests and laymen suffered 'not for

¹ The *Historia Particular de la Persecucion de Inglaterra*, published at Madrid by the Bishop of Tarraçona in 1599, makes a singular error under the year 1588. Mr. Widmerpole, tutor to the sons of the Countess of Northumberland, is divided and numbered so as to make three different persons, thus : '37, Wygmore ; 38, Pole ; 39, El maestro de los hijos de la condesa de Northumberland.' This curious mistake, pointed out by Mr. Law in an article in the *Month*, January 1879, was detected by Dr. Challoner, who reduced the three to one.

religion but for repeated acts of treason,' are reduced. It is gravely urged in Scudamore's *England and Rome*, and it is the most weighty argument in the book, that, as heretics suffered by fire, and traitors by axe and halter, therefore the Roman Catholic sufferers in Elizabeth's time must have been guilty of treason! This line of argument so approves itself to the Diocesan Church paper already referred to, that it not only adopts it, but italicises the point. And yet what is it worth? It is, of course, within the power of the legislature of any nation to docket whatsoever offences it pleases with any special label. If England had a Parliament so disposed, she might to-morrow decide that every hare-slayer was guilty of high treason, and anyone seeing the crime, and not reporting it to the nearest policeman, guilty of misprision of treason. Or the Upper House of Convocation might decree that who-soever did not *ex animo* declare his belief that Lord Penzance was the Dean of the Arches was a pestilent heretic. But would all this make any reasonable man apply the terms 'treason' or 'heresy' to the offences specified?

No doubt there is a point of view from which all martyrs may be described as traitors. Dr. Hook, speaking of the Marian martyrs, says: 'The law against heretics was fearfully cruel, and cruelly was it enforced, but not until heresy was confounded with treason, and the schismatic regarded as a rebel.' Our Blessed Lord was Himself crucified as a traitor. The excuse almost invariably made by the civilised nations who put to death the early Christians was, that they were a class of men who were turning the world upside down, and dangerous to existing institutions. Even with savage tribes of the present day, some secular motive is often concerned in the actual martyrdom, such as the avenging of offences committed by others, as in the case of our own saintly Bishop Patteson. Deprive the martyrologies of all those who have given real or imaginary offence to the State wherein they suffered, and the glorious bed-roll of the Church, now so thickly strewn with the acts of martyrs that cluster round the calendar day by day, will be but a sorry blank.

Nor should another point escape a brief mention. Compared with the death proper for heresy—burning at the stake—the death that awaited the Elizabethan martyrs was, as a rule, far more severe and prolonged. The punishment for high treason was a disgusting and obscene piece of butchery. Now and then it happened, from feelings of humanity, or accidentally, that the victim perished by the cord; but commonly the hanging was but little more than a rude shock. The

knife was the real instrument of execution. The body was cut down alive from the gallows, certain members were cut off, it was ripped up and disembowelled, and, bit by bit, thrown into a boiling cauldron of pitch, often before the open eyes and the speaking lips of the dying martyr. Some actually survived till the after process of quartering commenced. The accounts of several of these butcheries, wherein the executioner was unskilled in his awful trade, are indescribably ghastly. Such being the case, and there being little doubt that all the victims, if they had had their choice, would have preferred burning to butchery, it is rather too bad to deny martyrdom to the sufferers owing to the form of their death, a matter altogether out of their own control.

In this unhappy page of our national history there are but few reflections that bring any comfort ; still it is well and just to remember that the Church of England, as a Church, had no complicity with Elizabeth and the Privy Council in this miserable business ; that those of her bishops who took any active part in the persecution did so for the most part under compulsion, and many with obvious reluctance ; that several eminent Churchmen protested strenuously against the severity of the treatment ; that there were both clergy and laity, not a few in every shire, who, without any sympathy with the pretensions of Rome, were yet eager to afford protection, and what shelter they could, to those of the 'old religion ;' and that the most zealous in the bloody work, both within and without the Privy Council, and who often succeeded in persuading the Queen against her better judgment, were the Puritan faction, the very men who were ever scheming to degrade our own Church to the level of Continental Protestantism.

And, lastly, all who value their existing Church privileges owe them in no small degree to the staunchness and courage of these Roman martyrs. Though in respect of their Romanism we must regard them as seriously in error, nevertheless, it seems almost certain that the Puritan faction would have gained the mastery over Elizabeth's vacillating mind if it had not been that the necessity arose of administering, from time to time, rude checks to its arrogance, as it was plainly seen that otherwise the great mass of the conforming but earnest Churchmen might be driven into the Roman ranks. But be that as it may, what Christian can be found who, after reading the well-substantiated narratives of their pitiful sufferings, their ardent zeal for the souls of others, their joyous endurance of excruciating trials, and their fortitude in approaching a death of peculiar agony, could dare to

deny their genuine title to the martyr's crown? 'Through much tribulation we must enter into the Kingdom of God;' and well will it be for us, if we have marched as far as that noble army on the Royal Way of the Holy Cross.

ART. V.—NORWICH CATHEDRAL, AND THE
MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

1. *The Ancient Sculptures in the Roof of Norwich Cathedral.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich, and HENRY SYMONDS, M.A., Rector of Tivetshall. To which is added, a *History of the See of Norwich.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., and EDWARD HAILSTONE, Esq., Jun. (London, 1876.)
2. *The Life, Letters, and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich, and HENRY SYMONDS, M.A., Rector of Tivetshall. (Oxford and London, 1878.)
3. *Lectures on Mediæval Church History.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, Archbishop of Dublin. Second Edition. (London, 1879.)
4. *Mediæval Preachers and Mediæval Preaching.* By Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College. (London, 1873.)
5. *Divine Worship in England in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries Contrasted with and Adapted to that in the Nineteenth.* By JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., Recorder of Salisbury. Second Edition Revised. (London, 1877.)

THE splendidly *got-up* volume before us of the Dean of Norwich, and his co-adjutor editors, on his Cathedral, which, notwithstanding our cursory notice of it in a former number,¹ along with other Cathedrals, deserves a separate one, divides itself into two parts, the one historical, the other descriptive of the sculptures on the bosses of the nave-roof, which are said to be, and to make that Cathedral, unique. These sculptures, upon minute investigation, have been found to

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1878.

contain (with the exception of a gap from Solomon to the Annunciation) a continuous stream of Scripture history, from Genesis to the Last Judgment. In some few cases the interpretation of their subjects is conjectural; but the greatest care has been taken to arrive at their true meaning. Other parts of the Cathedral have similar bosses, but though some of them are noticed in the notes to the volume, they are of inferior interest. Photographs of the whole of the nave-bosses have been taken and are presented to the reader, the principal of these (in point of interest) on an enlarged scale. They do not appear to have been all the work of one artist, or to exhibit traces of very high art; nor have the artists' names been preserved to us; but they are due to the Episcopate of Bishop Lyhart, about A.D. 1450, who replaced with the present roof the old wooden Norman one, which, together with the nave itself, was (according to the best opinion) added by the second Bishop, Eborard. All the sculptures are coloured, and in the first and last bays the colours have been renewed. The editors have, to use their own words, 'agreeably diversified' to the reader the descriptive part of their work 'by flowers of devotion springing up under his feet,' in the shape of appropriate extracts from well-known authors, elucidatory of the subjects; of whom their favourites appear to be Bishop Hall, the present Bishop of Lincoln, and Lady Eastlake.

As a piece of minute criticism, we may regret, in passing, that the central photographs (in the un-enlarged series) on the central ribs of the vaulting, and which, therefore, most catch the eye, are frequently presented to the reader inverted, or, in common parlance, topsy-turvy; but this, we are informed, was unavoidable, unless the chronological order had been sacrificed. We must observe, too, that the *un-enlarged* photographs are too minute and indistinct for us to verify or follow the description of them, which, therefore, we think, had better have been confined to the *enlarged* series.

The most artistic subject is, we are told, 'Rebekah at the Well,' the description of which we give as a specimen:—

'And the damsel was very fair to look upon, and she went down to the well and filled her pitcher.'—Gen. xxiv. v. 16.

'The sculptor has probably arrived at giving effect to the words, "she was very fair to look upon," for the figure of Rebekah, to which it was not found possible to do justice in a photograph, is one of the most graceful which we meet with in the whole series of bosses. She is drawing water with a bucket worked by a pulley. She wears a long garment (gold) girded at the waist, close fitting above the girdle, and

flowing below it. Over her robe hangs an apron tied round her waist. Round her brow is a jewelled fillet, from which her hair hangs back behind. The bucket is red, and the rim of the well's parapet gold. In the background is foliage with fruit overhanging the well.'

Another of the best is, we think, that of the 'Temptation and the Fall':—

'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eye, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat.'—Gen. iii. v. 6.

'This is the great central boss of the first bay, and there is great character in the sculpture. The lower extremity of the serpent is coiled round the tree of knowledge of good and evil; the upper part of its body is that of a woman (although not so fully developed as in other mediæval representations of the tempter). The tree overhead is richly laden with fruit, and in each of his hands the devil holds up a golden apple, as if commending the fruit to the notice of our first parent. Below, on his left, is the woman, who also has an apple in each hand, and seems keen and eager about the newly-found treasure. On the right is Adam, who has received the fruit in his left hand only. His right hand is laid across his breast, and his countenance indicates a deeper emotion than Eve's—a mingled anxiety and curiosity. On the whole, the features of the two very fairly represent the fact given us by S. Paul, that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." His hair is black, as before; hers, yellowish.'

Or take, lastly, the *Drunkard's Everlasting Doom*: though a literary description of it alone can give but a faint conception of its expressiveness:—

'Look not thou upon the wine when it is red: when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.'—Prov. xxiii. 31, 32.

'A demon, more human in lineaments than some of the others represented in this bay, but having an indication of a tail, and painted entirely red, with very coarse features, is tilting out of a wheelbarrow, probably into the pit of the abyss, a male figure, who hides his face in his hands. On the shoulders of the demon a woman is sitting astride, her left hand holding on to the devil's head, whilst with her right she holds up, and seems to display to the man in the wheelbarrow, a jug or pitcher. It is as if she were remonstrating with him on the evil end to which his intemperance had brought him. The soil is green, with large gold flowers.

'If the monastic sculptor had in his mind the passage of the Proverbs which stands at the head of this article, it is possible that the woman may be intended to represent, not his lawful wife, but one of the "strange women" who had fascinated him when he was under the power of wine; and who is being carried off by the

devil to share his doom. His attitude, as he covers his eyes with his hands to prevent his seeing either the wine or the woman, is very expressive.'

We must not confound the history of Norwich with that of its Cathedral (the principal parts of the exterior of which, and of its precincts, are here also finely illustrated by photography) although they often run into each other, notably so in the quarrels between the monks and citizens, to which we shall presently refer, and although the City undoubtedly gathered importance and respectability from its connection with the See. Of that importance, six centuries later, Lord Macaulay has given a lively picture in a passage familiar, doubtless, to many of our readers, when—

'It was the capital of a large and fruitful province, the residence of a Bishop and of a Chapter; the chief seat of the chief manufacture of the realm. Some men distinguished by learning and science had recently dwelt there, and no place in the kingdom, except the capital and the universities, had more attractions for the curious. The library, the museum, the aviary, and the botanical garden of Sir Thomas Browne, were thought by Fellows of the Royal Society well worthy of a long pilgrimage. Norwich had also a Court in miniature. In the heart of the city stood an old palace of the Dukes of Norfolk, said to be the largest town house in the kingdom out of London. In this mansion, to which were attached a tennis court, a bowling green, and a wilderness, stretching along the banks of the Wansum, the noble family of Howard frequently resided and kept a state resembling that of petty sovereigns. Drink was served to guests in goblets of pure gold. The very tongs and shovels were of silver. Pictures by Italian masters adorned the walls. The cabinets were filled with a fine collection of gems purchased by the Earl of Arundel, whose marbles are among the ornaments of Oxford. Here, in the year 1671, Charles and his Court were sumptuously entertained. Here, too, all comers were annually welcomed from Christmas to Twelfth Night. Ale flowed in oceans for the populace. Three coaches, one of which was built at a cost of four hundred pounds to contain fourteen persons, were sent every afternoon round the City to bring ladies to the festivities; and the dances were always followed by a luxurious banquet. When the Duke of Norfolk came to Norwich he was greeted like a king returning to his capital. The bells of the Cathedral and of St. Peter Mancroft were rung, the guns of the Castle were fired, and the Mayor and Aldermen waited on their illustrious fellow-citizen with complimentary addresses.'¹

It was also a City Corporate. In short, its history was a considerable and progressive one, though it consisted more in its commercial activity and the splendid hospitalities of

¹ *History of England*, vol. i. pp. 336, 337.

its great proprietors, than in any prominent part it took in politics or war; whereas neither the Bishops themselves, nor the Deans (who succeeded the Priors of the Monastery at the Dissolution), at least after the twelfth century, figured conspicuously in the general history of the times. There were, it is true, John of Oxford, who presided over the 'Constitutions of Clarendon;' and Pandulph, the diplomatist and legate, who owes his immortality to Shakespeare, who perhaps makes too much of him when he says—

'For even the breath of what I mean to speak
Shall blow each dust, each straw, each little rub
Out of the path which shall directly lead
Thy foot to England's throne.'

There was Raleigh the courtier, and De Suffield the non-courtier, Bishop. It had Thomas Percy the noble Bishop, and De Spencer the martial Bishop; De Middleton, who helped pass the statute of 'Circumspecte agatis,' and Salmon, who assisted at the coronation of Edward II.; but as a body of divines the Norwich line was not, at least before the Reformation, remarkable. It can boast of no Beckett or Wykeham, nor, like Lincoln, of its Hugo, whom even Mr. Froude, in his depreciatory *flings* at mediæval biographies in general, cannot help singling out for praise in his chapter on a 'great subject in the twelfth century.'¹

Nor are we to think of Norwich as the parent see. The older history of the Diocese is singular from its frequent translations. The *kingdom* of East Anglia contained Norfolk, Suffolk, and at least part of Cambridgeshire, and the *Diocese* contained all Norfolk (except Emmett and the overlappings of a few Norfolk parishes in Cambridgeshire), and all Suffolk (except Feckenham, which belonged to Rochester, and a few peculiars of Canterbury).

It was natural, then, that Dunwich should have been first selected to give name to the see. Itself a Roman port and military station, a Royal Saxon residence and seat of government, and the capital of East Anglia—Dunwich, of which the traveller now sees nothing, except the ruins of its Franciscan Convent—Dunwich, which the wild waves of that angry coast have long asserted their supremacy over, and engulfed, but which in 1173 was still a strong fortress, could help Edward I. with eleven ships of war, and promise sixteen to Edward III. to take Calais with—Dunwich, with its fourteen

¹ *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, by J. A. Froude, vol. ii. p. 60, ed. 1876.

churches, its hospitals, almshouses, and convents, was clearly fitted to be the metropolis of a Christian Bishopric, as it already was the second city in the Kingdom.

Bisius, the fourth Dunwich Bishop, unable probably from age to work so large a diocese, divided it, retaining Dunwich for Suffolk, and choosing North Elmham for the northern county, a village which we can find no reason for having this honour conferred on it, except perhaps that it had been the station of a Roman Flamen, and was tolerably central. Wilbrid, the eleventh Dunwich Bishop, re-united the see, but fixed it at North Elmham, and not at Dunwich, which was becoming more and more invaded by the sea (we read of its being 'swallowed up,' *temp. Edw. Conf.*), and Suffolk henceforth never regained her ecclesiastical supremacy. Nor did Elmham long enjoy it. The transfer to Thetford, the more celebrated Thetford, is thus narrated by Dugdale: 'Sedem ex villa de Helmham ad locum celebriorem Thetfordiam transtulit, quæ olim urbecula solio regum est Anglorum et octo semel monasteriis emicuisse fertur.' Then arose Norwich; and though a See is a See, and a Bishop a Bishop, wherever he is, it must have been a great change. Hitherto the Cathedral had probably been of timber, and no more resembled that of the See which was now to succeed it, than the humble structures of the Bishops of Colorado among the Rocky Mountains, or of Bishop Webb at Bloemfontein, are like Westminster Abbey. 'From out of that sluggish and salt estuary, which was spreading itself over the lowlands,' was to uprise that wondrous tower which was 'for ever after to arrest the eye and attract the admiration of wanderers on the heath,' and to add one more to the list of those Norman beauties which were silently springing up around. At one and the same time might be seen rising, under Remigius, the western front of Lincoln; under Lanfranc, the nave of Canterbury; under Aldred, the crypt chapels surrounding the choir and nave of Gloucester; the noble semi-circular arches of Durham, Worcester, and Peterborough; and the tower of Winchester under Walkelyn.

Marvellous thought! that in an age of violence, when life and property were insecure beyond all precedent, and pillage and rapine, cruelty and lust, were rampant and abroad—edifices like these should have been quietly and simultaneously rearing their heads through the land.

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the work of many successive hands, is one of our great authentic sources of history; and here is its picture of society in the days of Stephen:—

'They had done homage (to Stephen) and sworn oaths, but they no faith kept; all became forsworn, and broke their allegiance; for

every rich man built his castles, and defended them against him, and they filled the land full of castles. They greatly oppressed the wretched people by making them work at these castles, and when the castles were finished, they filled them with devils and evil men. Then they took those whom they suspected to have any goods, by night and by day, seizing both men and women, and they put them in prison for their gold and silver, and tortured them with pains unspeakable, for never were any martyrs tormented as these were. They hung some up by their feet, and smoked them with foul smoke; some by their thumbs, or by the head, and they hung burning things on their feet. They put a knotted string about their heads, and twisted it till it went into the brain. They put them into dungeons wherein were adders, and snakes, and toads, and thus wore them out. At length they spared neither church nor churchyard, but they took all that was valuable therein, and then burned the church and all together. Neither did they spare the lands of bishops, nor of abbots, nor of priests; but they robbed the monks and the clergy, and every man plundered his neighbour as much as he could. If two or three men came riding to a town, all the township fled before them, and thought they were robbers. The bishops and clergy were ever cursing them, but this to them was nothing, for they were all accursed, and forsworn, and reprobate. The earth bare no corn; you might as well have tilled the sea; for the land was all ruined by such deeds, and it was said openly, that Christ and His saints slept. These things, and more than we can say, did we suffer during nineteen years because of our sins.'

And yet, as we have said, it was at this very moment that those imperishable works were rising, and which have survived all changes. Vast forests have disappeared, and turned to peat or jet. Towns and cities have come and gone; *here* our sea-board, as at Norwich, has receded, *there*, as at Dunwich, encroached, for miles. Rivers have changed their courses; landslips have hurled huge rocks headlong, like boulders, to the shore. The whole aspect of our landscapes has in ten centuries been transformed—but our cathedrals still remain.

'The three beautiful sisters of the vale, the spires of Lichfield (*so* beautiful, that old Fuller suggests that they should only be shown on great festivals); the glorious towers of Lincoln, on its sovereign hill, the delight of Southey and of Wordsworth; the majestic pile of York, perhaps the most admired in modern times (although Lord Burlington could not award his preference); the massive grandeur of Durham, immortalised by Scott and Johnson; the grace of Salisbury; the unequalled front of Wells; the triple porches or gallery of Peterborough; the soaring angel steeple of Canterbury; and its more than rival at Gloucester—if lost, would be irreparable.'

¹ Walcott's *Traditions and Customs of Cathedrals*, p. vi.

In the above beautiful passage Mr. Walcott does not mention Norwich by name, though he might well have done so, and it is included in his general panegyric. But he has a word for it elsewhere, when he describes—

‘The lofty spire of its central tower, like a *spear thrust into the skies*, the noble transept and tiers of arcades, along the south side of the nave, the knots of ornament, as we retire to contemplate the entire structure, appearing faint and inconsiderable beside the buttressed pier and fearless height of the spire, as the shadows steal back along the buttresses (like a receding tide leaves the robbed sands), now chasing each other like the cloud-stains on the downside, and now flung in fantastic shapes on the chequered cloister-sward.’

It is its decided Norman character that makes it, notwithstanding its smaller size, comparatively undecorated aspect, and cramped position, one of the most interesting of our cathedrals. Its tower is the loftiest and richest in England, and its cloisters, with perhaps the exception of Gloucester, the fairest and most spacious.

Speaking of cloisters, no one who has read Dean Church's *Anselm* will think meanly of them, as if they were only the insignificant adjunct of a cathedral.

‘The cloister was the place of business, instruction, reading, and conversation, the common study, workshop, and parlour of all the inmates of the house, the professed brethren ; the young men, whom they were teaching or preparing for life, either as monks or in the world ; the children (*infantes*), who formed the school attached to the house, many of whom had been dedicated to this kind of service. In this cloister, open apparently to the weather, but under shelter, all sat, when they were not at service in church, or assembled in the chapter, or at their meals in the refectory, or resting in the dormitory for their mid-day sleep ; or teaching, reading, writing, copying, or any handicraft, in which a monk might employ himself, went on here. Here the children learned their letters, or read aloud, or practised their singing under their masters ; and here, when the regular and fixed arrangements of the day allowed it, conversation was carried on. A cloister of this kind was the lecture-room where Lanfranc taught “grammar,” gave to Norman pupils elementary notions of what an Italian of that age saw in Virgil and S. Augustine, and perhaps expounded S. Paul's Epistles ; where Anselm, among other pupils, caught from him the enthusiasm of literature ; where, when Lanfranc was gone, his pupil carried on his master's work as a teacher, and where he discussed with sympathising and inquisitive minds the great problems which had begun to open on his mind.’

The thought of the cloister ‘open to the weather,’ and of Orderic, the chronicler of the times, writing (or rather leaving off writing) his history, with ‘fingers stiffened with cold, till

warmer weather came,' touches the Dean's risible nerves, and with some humour he stops to ask how 'poor Orderic' (who, by the way, seems a favourite of his) would have fared, if he had to face, in his cloister, the blasts of a Norwich, instead of a Normandy, winter; whilst Herbert's 'letter' of reproof to 'Brother Godfrey,' the peccant monk, suggests to him that his (Godfrey's) turn was more for 'talking rooms' than 'teaching rooms,' and for the 'chatter house' rather than the 'Chapter House'!

We know that, occasionally, bishops themselves handled the trowel and spread the mortar, but this was the exception. Whose hands laboured at the very work? whose art planned and applied, in that rude Norman age, mouldings which we cannot equal, and fair proportions we cannot surpass? Who chiselled so exquisitely that stone which we gaze at now so reverently, and travel days to see? We should have liked to know these and similar particulars—above all, how this wonderfully anomalous state of things is to be accounted for; endless praise *within* those walls; endless strife *without*: consecrated temples, *here*; unconsecrated lives, *there*? Was it a compromise which the Evil One was allowed to make with Holiness; a compact between superstition and vice, a plenary indulgence granted for past sins? Surely the truth is exactly the reverse, and that these were the *fortresses* which the pious thinkers and workers of the age erected; those

'spiritual freemasons,' to use Archbishop Trench's striking simile (*p.* 200), who 'did not leave off, until there had risen up under their hands structures as marvellous in an architectonic completeness of their own, as the magnificent domes and cathedrals which, at the self-same time, were everywhere covering the face of Europe with novel forms of grace and beauty'—

but who were silently making their influence felt through the length and breadth of the land, and counteracting by practice and by precept the evil lives around them.

The transition from the exterior fabric to the internal worship in it, is easy; and the question naturally occurs, of what sort was it (of the sermons delivered in it we shall speak presently); and surely Mr. Chambers has done no useless service in presenting to us, in the elaborate work announced on our title-page, a *résumé* of the worship of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, although he does not expressly name the Norwich 'use,' which, however, was nearly identical with that of Sarum. For assuredly our cathedrals did not grow for nothing, but an almost ceaseless service of praise and prayer was going on within, which expressed, if possible, still more

forcibly the existence of a deep religious reality, notwithstanding the extraordinary state of society around. Upon the details of that service, which Mr. Chambers has so carefully preserved, we cannot enter at any length; but we must cite the following passage from the preface to his work, on a more general view of the subject:—

‘ Ecclesiastical architecture, as all must acknowledge, culminated, attaining its highest excellence, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries of our era, and it has happily become an accepted duty, an incontrovertible axiom, with the great majority of well-informed Englishmen, that their churches ought to be built or restored after the models which that age has furnished. The reasons for this conclusion are obvious. Not only are the forms of construction then adopted by our ancestors abstractedly of surpassing elegance, and most agreeable to the eye; but to every considerate observer they are also eminently adapted for duly setting forth the paramount dignity and importance of Divine worship in general, the highest duty and privilege of man, and for the honourable celebration of the great mystery of our religion, the Holy Eucharist in particular; moreover, for impressing upon the minds and hearts of all the grandeur and sublimity of the Catholic Faith. If, then, the mediæval church builders, with their exquisite and elevated taste, emanating as it did from a comprehensive and spiritualised intellect, succeeded in representing and embodying these objects and sentiments in their imperishable material work, it was also to be expected that the clergy and laity of those ages of faith, for whom these noble edifices were reared, would also in the order and method of their liturgies and sacramental ordinances realise, and show forth in act, a like spiritualised beauty, splendour, significance and reverence in their devotions, as well as express vividly thereby the unspeakable importance of the same eternal verities of the Faith. And such is the undoubted fact. It is historically certain that, at no period during the existence of the Church of Christ, was Divine worship and the celebration of the Sacraments conducted with such impressive earnestness, reverence, decorum, and refined splendour, as between the years of Our Lord 1200 and 1400.’

Glowing, then, with some such estimate, as we have ourselves adopted, of the value of our cathedrals, we can well appreciate the enthusiasm which has led Dean Goulburn to compile and hand down to future generations an exhaustive and masterly account of the cathedral over which he has been called to preside. Surely it is a work worthy of a Dean; and he has done it, and done it well.

Undoubtedly, its founder and first bishop, Herbert of Losinga, was a man conspicuous in his generation, and beyond it. His ‘Life’ (which with a translation of his principal ‘Letters,’ not now published for the first time, forms the

second work at the head of our paper) is soon told. Born of a good county family in Suffolk about A.D. 1050, and taking his name of Losinga, in all probability, from the part of the county where his father had property, he received his early education at Fécamp, of which he became a professed monk, and subsequently prior. Preferred by William Rufus to the abbacy of the mitred Benedictine Abbey of Ramsey in Huntingdonshire, he seems in A.D. 1091 to have procured for himself the See of Thetford, and for his father the abbacy of Hyde Abbey in Winchester, but not without the payment down to the Crown of the good round sum of 1900*l*. His conscience striking him for this kind of simony, he contrives to reach Rome without the King's leave, with a view to resign his episcopal insignia at the feet of the Pope, who, however, insisted on returning them to him, and at the same time allowed him to change the See to Norwich, which accordingly he did in 1094, and two years after laid the first stone of his cathedral there. The portions of it which are due to him are, or were, the Presbytery (or Eastern arm of the church beyond the transept), with its trefoil of chapels, the transept itself, and the lower stages of the tower, together with those three bays of the nave, which in Norman churches were screened off to make the choir (his choir and transept, however, having wooden roofs). He next turned his attention to an Episcopal palace, of which that part that till very recently joined the cathedral on the north, was undoubtedly his.

In 1104, he instituted Cluniac monks at Thetford (a sort of compensation to that town for the removal of the see). In 1106, he built the Benedictine Monastery at Norwich 'on the south and sunny side of his church,' and attended at Ely the grand ceremonial of the second translation of the body of S. Etheldreda. In 1107, he was chosen ambassador to Rome with two others, in order to come to some understanding with the Pontiff on lay investitures (a previous mission of Bishop Warelwast, of Exeter, for that purpose having failed), and to gain an acknowledgement of his own Episcopal rights over S. Edmund's Bury Abbey. But both objects failed, and brought no honour on his negotiations. In 1116, he was singled out, as one of the most eminent Prelates of the day, with Hugh, Abbot of Chisbury, to attend the Primate, Archbishop Ralph, to Rome, to set at rest for ever the question of the independence of the English Church; but the journey was an ill-starred one. Herbert was detained by illness at Placentia, and his colleagues failed in their object, obtaining only the evasive answer, that all the privileges of the Church of

Canterbury should be maintained; which meant nothing; for it did not state what they were. This was the last act of his public life. His last recorded one was his following Queen Matilda to her grave. On July 22, 1119, he himself expired, and was laid before the high altar of his cathedral in a sarcophagus, where it continued till the Rebellion, when it was probably razed by the Puritans; but Dean Prideaux in 1651, reared a lasting epitaph to his memory. A question has been raised whether he was ever Lord Chancellor; and, after balancing the evidence, Dr. Goulburn inclines to the affirmative: but it is hardly necessary to add that, in those times, the Chancellor was by no means the important state personage he is now, when he is only the second in rank below the Blood Royal. He was, then, inferior, *eg.*, to the chief justiciary; he had no Court of Equity to preside over; and thus he had little scope, or indeed need, for the intellectual powers for which later Chancellors have been usually chosen. His literary remains were fourteen sermons (of which presently); a treatise on the length of the ages, and the end of the world; a book on monastic constitutions; letters; and an address to Anselm. He left behind him, besides his own, five churches—two in Norwich, one at North Elmham, one at Lynn, and one at Yarmouth—of which the two last still remain to attest the magnificence of his architectural designs.

We wish we could take as favourable a view of Bishop Herbert's character as his biographer does (and as it was natural that he should) in the following summary of it, dwelling

'first of all on that exceeding sensitiveness of soul, which takes trouble so much to heart. Then the great redeeming trait of his character, the way in which this sensitiveness helped forward and deepened his personal repentance; flowed in the channel which grace had carved for it, and was thus preserved from being the mere frantic laceration of the natural man.'

And again, when he takes

'leave of him with the feeling that he has a true title to the veneration and affection of posterity, not only as one in advance of his times in respect of intellectual gifts and attainments, but also as a good pastor, who tended gently and faithfully the sheep of Christ, and as a character intensely human, if in his sins and foibles, so also in his sympathies and affections.'

We fear that simony was not his only sin, nor that which in after life he most lamented. He repeatedly refers to other sins. Else, why such expressions as the following?—

'I have sinned not only in the reading of heathen authors, but also in the base conduct and actions of the same.'

Nor was it for any simony they were likely to stimulate, that he besought his young friends to abstain from them.

'Come, most passionless Judge, exact from me a worthy revenge—punish my levity, chastise my wantonness, my past life being darkened by many foul sins.'

'We who are defiled with the mire of our lusts, and in whom the spiritual life is strangled by the allurements of deadly passions.'

And, after all, when simony was stalking unblushingly through the land, it is hardly likely he should take it to heart so much. Be the crimes, however, which pressed so heavily on Bishop Herbert's whole after-life, what they were, we trust his repentance was sincere; but we cannot quite perceive how his biographer arrives so readily at the conclusion that it was. What evidence is there? The letters to his favourite boys certainly are not; if they contain good advice at all, it is chiefly educational. Church building is not. We know, from the highest authority, that many in that day shall say, and say in vain, 'Lord, Lord, have we not in Thy name done many *wonderful works*?'¹

The question propounded by Herbert of laying aside the study of the heathen classical poets, for their impurities, is one which must force itself upon every thoughtful and well-meaning mind; and being one which any conscientious headmaster, and therefore Dr. Goulburn himself, must have had frequently upon his mind, we should have been glad if in his notes to Herbert's 'Letters' he had given us also more of his own views. It is curious that in the various commissions and statutes we have had on educational matters, as they regard our great 'seminaries of religious and useful learning,' we do not find more inquiry into this subject. We presume, therefore, it remains with the approbation of society.

The Bishop's strong sense, therefore, of the heathen poets as the seed-plots of ill, though it appears to have come upon him late in life, has in it some force, and we cannot shut our eyes to it. But if he were sincere in his depreciation of

¹ Mr. Walcott, citing Knyghton, speaks of a Herbert Lozinga of Hereford (there was no such person), and makes him a bit of an astrologer, stating that he alone of the Bishops refused to come to the consecration of Lincoln Cathedral, declaring he 'had read by the stars the untimely death of Remigius, and therefore declined a fruitless journey.' (*Memoirs of Lincoln*, pp. 17, 18.) The story is true, and told by William of Malmesbury, of Bishop ROBERT (*Lotharingus*), of Hereford.

them, why advise his pupils Otho and Willelm to be urgent and diligent with them? Why such a sentence as this?—

‘So I, too, my well-beloved, gave up my poetry when you became poets, thinking it beneath me to employ myself in those studies. Nevertheless, I enjoin you to exercise your talents as boys: write to me, therefore, in poetry, frame verses, compose odes, sing in metre, and rejoice the heart of your aged friend by cultivating *the Muses in every form.*’

How is it that the same hand could write—

‘If henceforth then you mean to be guided by my judgment, adopt the style of Ovid. To talk about Ovid is of very little value, unless you *learn from Ovid how to talk,*

and this—

‘Unseemly is it that Christ should be preached, and Ovid recited, by the same mouth. Nor can that heart set forth the truth of the Gospel aright, which makes search into the shameful impurities of the poets.’

It is true that he distinguishes, in the above, between what is permitted to youth and to hoar hairs, and yet we cannot see how that, which was so essentially bad as to deserve his epithets of ‘buffoonery’ and ‘obscenity,’ could be venial in the one and unpardonable in the other.

However this may be, here is his adieu to the Muses, which presents us also with as fair a specimen, as we can choose, of his style of letter writing. It is, as usual, to his favourite choristers and pupils:—

‘*To Otto and Willelm.*

‘Ye work hard, my well-beloved sons, and endeavour to supplant my resolution by frequently coaxing me to write to you in verse; but it is impious and profane to offer resistance to divine oracles and sacred revelations. Much indeed should I wish to condescend to your request, and to reply to your compositions in a similar style; but the sternness of my (now) awakened resolve forbids me to do so, and makes me fearful of joining you in your literary sports, whatever grave sentences of authority might be pleaded for my doing so. To you, young as you are, it is permitted to amuse yourselves, while to my hoar hairs it is enjoined to meditate upon and search into the secret things of the scriptures, and the hidden mysteries (of the Gospel). Accordingly I have renounced the poets, and the dramas of the poets, and take no more delight in their *buffooneries*. It is not the part of a bishop to sit in the playhouse, but to preach in the church; he is not to occupy himself with the *obscenities* of the theatre, or the cruelties of the circus, but with the law of God, and the words of the Holy Gospel. We, too, have authors who indited the truth,

which we acknowledge ; and who far excel your authors, inasmuch as they are proved to be lovers of God alone. Moses, that offspring of the Nile, to whom God first appeared in the bush, and who ten times scourged the obduracy of the Egyptians with so many strokes, so sublime a prophet that he drowned the chariots of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, and led forth the people of God dry shod through the same sea in safety ; Moses, who fed God's people with manna in the wilderness, reared up the tabernacle, promulgated the Law ; Moses, who set forth in writing the early history of the world down to the entrance of the people upon the inheritance which God had covenanted to give them ; Moses did not cramp his inspired sentences into metrical feet, but threw his prophetic narrative into the form of prose. So did also Isaiah, and the other prophets, who lingered fondly enough on weighty sentiments, not beneath that foliage of style, which obscures, while it embellishes. So, too, the Evangelists and Apostles served up to the world the sweet viand of the Incarnate Word (honey, as it were, in a comb of frail wax), heeding little the graces of style, but having their whole minds absorbed in the greatness of the miracle. Look ye also to the modern Fathers, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, or any other defenders of our holy religion ; and ye shall find that they enlighten the Holy Church, not by poetical strains, but by the understanding of the truth. For which reasons, my well-beloved sons, let it be clear to you that, your importunity notwithstanding, I have resolved that ye shall no more see any verses of mine, but that in my replies to you ye will have to quaff draughts of divine truth out of earthen vessels. For we bear about the treasures of Christian wisdom, not in the pride of lofty eloquence, but in purity of conscience, in devotion of life, and in sanctification of the flesh.'

It gives one a strange idea of Herbert's perception, or rather want of it, to find him saying that the prophets were not poets. What would he say of the song of Deborah *the Prophetess* ? Moreover, in citing Moses as an authority for his position, he must have forgotten his triumphal ode on the Red Sea's eastern shore. To be a poet, it is not necessary to throw one's words into 'metrical feet.'

But perhaps we moderns who come after Bishop Lowth may judge him too hardly. And certainly there is not a whit less poetry, probably more, in the 'Like as the hart desireth the water brooks' than in its metrical expansion beginning—

'As pants the hart for cooling streams ;'

nor in the 'Benedicite,' or the song of the Three Children, than in its modern development beginning—

'Ye floods and ocean billows.'

Archbishop Trench, in speaking of the transition from the metrical forms of the classical poetry of Rome to the accented

rhythm of later days, and from that rhythm again to the still more modern rhyme, observes that—

‘Beauty of outline, beauty of form (and what a flood of light does that one word *forma*, as equivalent to beauty, pour on the difference between the heathen and the Christian ideal of beauty !), this was all which the old poetry yearned after and strove to embody; this was all which its metrical frameworks were perfectly fitted to embody. But now Heaven had been opened, and henceforward the mystical element of modern poetry demanded its rights; vaguer but vaster thoughts were craving to find the harmonies to which they might be married for ever. The boundless could not be content to find its organ in that, of which the very perfection lay in its limitations and bounds.’¹

‘Hard measure is often dealt to this (mediaeval) poetry. Men come to it with a taste formed on quite other models; trying it by laws which were not *its* laws, by the approximation which it makes to a standard which is so far from being *its* standard, that the nearer it reaches that, the further removed from any true value it is. They come, trying the Gothic Cathedral by the laws of the Greek Temple, and because they do not find in it that which, in its very faithfulness to its own idea, it cannot have, they treat it as worthy only of scorn and contempt.’²

And what can be more beautiful than Adam of S. Victor’s hymn on the Resurrection? We quote its first stanza only:—

‘Mundi renovatio
Nova parit gaudia,
Resurgente Domino
Conresurgunt omnia;
Elementa serviunt,
Et auctoris sentiunt,
Quanta sint sollemnia.’

With the high ritual melodies which, according to Mr. Chambers, must have been for ever floating through his roof, it is wonderful that Herbert could have so decried poetry, or plumed himself on his authors having none. *But they had*: S. Ambrose was a poet. It was, too, after the Apostles had ‘sung an hymn,’ on the greatest and most solemn occasion, that they ‘went out to the Mount of Olives.’ And has the Church ever received a greater boon than in the chaunt immortalised by the name of Gregory, or in the ‘Hymns Ancient and Modern,’ which our Anglican Branch of it has adopted with a marvellous unanimity, and which speak with peculiar solemnity to those who, like ourselves, have taken ‘sweet counsel together and walked in the House of God as friends’

¹ *Sacred Latin Poetry* (second edition), Introd. 8. ² *Ibid.* 48.

with some of their saintly authors, now themselves in heaven? To tire of poetry then, to disparage poetry, seems a sort of *petit treason* against heaven!

Here is one more specimen of Herbert's '*Letters*' (though it is really a '*Sermon*') which is unexceptionable, and shows moreover his familiarity with the pages he had abjured:—

'Herbert to Otto and Willelm.

'After sailing down the impetuous streams of infancy and boyhood, ye are now fairly launched upon the open sea of youth, the navigation of which sea is fraught with great dangers, unless Christ be present at the helm. Youth is indeed afloat in the midst of divers dangers, unlimited in number, and the report of which may well inspire terror. On one side gluttony and drunkenness weigh down the soul; lust and incontinence disgrace the body; according to that word of the Apostles, "He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body." In another quarter covetousness and anger eat into the mind, melancholy and *ennui* strangle good intention; vain glory and pride empty out the treasures of a mind which is not on its guard (against their encroachments). Worst of all, the fickleness of youth is such that it varies with every change of circumstance.

'Such are the perils of youth, deeper than the stones, more rugged than the rocks, more fell than Scylla and Charybdis, more calamitous than (the promontory) Palinurus, more cruel than quicksands and pirates, winds and waves.

'Truly youth is a vast sea and stretcheth wide its arms! In it are creeping things which cannot be numbered—songs of Sirens, and infernal sand-reefs beguile those who are not warned of them, and poor youths, deluded by that which has the semblance of an exchange, are dashed on foreign strands to become the prey of unclean spirits.

'And who is sufficient for these things? Whose soul shall offer a firm resistance to dangers so many and so great? A raft¹ is plainly requisite, but (it must be one) so strong and so compacted of planks, which cannot be sundered, that it shall not shrink from the encounter with such terrible dangers. This, therefore, is the raft on which in the midst of this world's sea our Saviour climbed up, and whereon he was transported from a state of suffering to a state exempt from suffering, from corruption to incorruption, from mortality to immortality, from death to life, from earth to heaven. Mount ye this raft, my sons, with speed and alacrity; by its safe conveyance surmount the shipwreck of this world's unbelief; come ye to Christ's ship, and quietly allow Christ to be your pilot, and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for Christ's "yoke is easy and His burden is light." Why are ye in such a state of trepidation? Why dread ye the perils of the deep? Your Pilot laid His command upon the winds; your Pilot walked across the waves with feet which sank not in. There is no handiwork which can resist the Craftsman; unto Him, Who

¹ By the *raft* the Cross is generally supposed to be meant.

created all things out of nothing, no circumstances can present an impossibility. The will of God is the alone cause of the existence of things. Ye are risen with Christ; seek those things which are above, not those which are upon the earth; sow ye to the Spirit, and not to the flesh, for "he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." You allege youth as an excuse (for your excesses), yet not all youths (in age) are youths (in character); whence comes that saying of Holy Scripture, "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth,"¹ and in another place, "The understanding of a man is grey hairs; and an unspotted life is old age." Samuel, when a child, pronounced the deposition of Eli; and Daniel, while he was a young boy, convicted and condemned the elders in Babylon. Awake (to righteousness) and flee the unstable Euripus of lust. Let your (only) brotherhood be one of chastity, and there fasten the anchor of your hope. Crucify your members with your vices and lusts; rear the mast of faith, and hoist upon it the sails of virtues. Catch in these the gales of the Holy Spirit. Make sail for your country, and your city, having Christ for your Pilot; and so with prosperous course shall ye enter into the harbour of the heavenly shore. There shall ye find God your Father; ye shall find, too, your Holy Mother, to wit the Church. You shall find there your brethren and fellow-citizens, the Saints, the Angels, and all the Elect of God, yea, and the intimacy of every tender tie, whereby your enjoyment shall be continually renewed, and your eternity made delightful, and your bliss made eternal. Ye shall be enriched with treasures and delights, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, which your Pilot hath prepared as a recompense for the labours of your trafficking (*quas vester Gubernator vestrorum negotiorum præparavit laboribus*).² Wherever I am, I am mindful of the perils of your situation, and so have written this letter to remind you of them, as you probably disguise them from yourselves. See that ye write me an answer in a similar strain.'

We cannot admire the adulation Herbert bestowed on great people, nor such egotism as the following:—

'Pray have a care of yourselves. You are writing not to a stock, but to a most acute and far-sighted man, who, when he has heard one word, gains from it an insight into, and takes a survey of, your whole mind.'

Or as this—

¹ It is not easy to see the applicability of Herbert's first quotation. It is, however, we think, as though he had said, 'You allege youth as an excuse for your indulgence in pleasures: but remember it is not really so. It was *in irony*, that the Word of God bade the young man rejoice in his pleasures, for it goes on to say that "for all these things God will bring him into judgment."'

² Perhaps with an allusion to the merchant man in the Gospel seeking goodly pearls. *Negotia* in the plural often means *mercatura*—(Faccioliati, tit. '*Negotium*').

'Give heed to what I say, for no secrets are hid from him whom logic enlightens!'

But what shall we say of the man who, after inculcating the Apostle's precept, 'Owe no man anything, but to love one another'—a precept, one would think, placed far above the level of jest and parody—and his own obedience to it—

'Do not fear my keeping them (your tablets), for I do not care to owe any man anything save love only, and the kind actions which are its fruits'—

could parody it *in act*, by retaining the palfrey which his friend had lent him, and *in word*, by declaring 'the most Righteous Judge would restore it to thee one day in a flowery plain' (although Dean Goulburn thinks he can cap the *facetiæ* by one of a well-known Oxford professor, who addressed a poem to 'My pony in a better world')?—or how defend his passionate anathemas, and gravest excommunication of the offender who broke into his park and killed his only deer; although here, too, we note the Dean's excuse for him, that the fault was (looking at the frequency of excommunications at that time) that of the age rather than the man?

The truer, however, may be our own estimate of the Bishop's character, the more skilful is the management of it in Dr. Goulburn's hand, and it is impossible not to wish to feel more leniently towards him when we find him in such good hands, and ourselves at issue with so fair a judge of character.

The 'Sermons of De Lösinga' (fourteen in number), in their original Latin, and transcribed from a MS. formerly belonging to Norwich, but 'alienated with other MS. treasures of the Church in evil times,' and now in the possession of the library of Cambridge University, are for the first time offered to the public, and appear in print side by side with an English translation and notes by the joint editors. We regret that Dr. Neale, in his selection of famous mediæval preachers, could not include Bishop Herbert's sermons. We should have liked, too, to know the style and delivery of the preacher. The place of delivery, was it his Cathedral? His audience, were they, as Dean Goulburn seems inclined to think, the lawless nobles of the day, whose portrait has been already drawn, and whom the following denunciation would seem to fit, in his sermon on Easter, which thus abruptly and effectively begins:—

'Think of your fathers, grandfathers, great-grandfathers, and ancestors. They have passed away, never again to return to this present life. Seeing ye are about to follow the dead, why deal ye so much with the things of this life? Death knocks at the door of your

castles, and do ye fill them with riches? Whence the Lord saith most fitly to a certain rich and covetous man, "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be taken away from thee, and whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" A stern rebuke! would God that it might pierce your heart of hearts! Surely the world would then begin to be held cheap by you, and ye would condemn your sins, and ceasing from the oppression of the innocent, ye would show the bowels of Christian compassion to the poor. Know ye, brethren, that the Church's poor are themselves among the saints whose festival ye are to-day celebrating. Make them your friends, as the Lord saith, that, when you shall "fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings." The holy poor are lean with hunger, and shiver with cold, but hereafter in heaven they shall be kings, and in the presence of God shall sit in judgment upon your crimes, and those of all the wicked.—Such words appear to you unreasonable, but the truth of the Gospel abideth in all its purity.'

The following is the fine exordium of his sermon on Easter Day:—

'To-day, dearly beloved brethren, is marked by the honour which the resurrection has over other festivals, and the whole world of creatures saluteth the rising Lord. From one side the heaven speaks to mortal man by stars and angels. From another the sky holdeth back its snows and frosts. From another the water gives a passage to the feet, which settle upon it. From another quarter hell gives up the souls, which it had in keeping, and the earth returns the bodies which she was cherishing. While from another the melody of birds, and everything corporal and incorporeal, rejoiceth in the Redeemer's triumph, and resteth not day and night. Mourning for the counsel of Caiaphas and the treachery of Judas hath taken flight, and the tears of the faithful for the Passion and Cross of the Lord are dried up. Ye have heard that the Lord was saturated with gall, and had vinegar given Him to drink, but to-day He sitteth in heavenly places with God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, satiated with the redemption of mankind.'

The question arises, Could so illiterate an audience understand Latin? Upon this, Dr. Neale says—

'The third point which should be considered in the perusal of any mediæval sermon is this, whether it was originally delivered in Latin, or in the vernacular language of this country. One thing seems next to certain, that the great preachers of those times, whenever they did use the vernacular language, spoke in it *extempore*; for who would take the trouble of committing his thoughts to a dialect so barbarous, that perhaps it could not be written with precision, and so fluctuating, that it was certain to be unintelligible within half a century? The sermons *ad populum* in the eighth and tenth centuries, then, must have been translated into Latin by some of the disciples of the author from their recollection of what he had actually spoken,

or by the writer himself from recollection of the general scope and aim of his discourse.'¹

The distinguishing characters of a mediæval sermon, as given by Dr. Neale, seem fulfilled in those before us, viz.—

(i.) The immense and almost intuitive knowledge of Scripture which they contain, and, as inseparably connected with this knowledge and allusion, the mystical interpretation with which they overflow.

(ii.) Their power of adaptation to the wants and requirements of the poor and ignorant, the care they show in avoiding difficult expressions and trains of thought liable to be misunderstood, and the introduction of even ludicrous anecdotes and stories, to illustrate any point that might occur.

(iii.) The aim and design to be dramatic in effect.

Congregationalism in Wales at the present day, in many of its peculiarities, gives us, perhaps, the best idea of what mediæval preaching must have been; but it lacks its polish. But to return.

The following is the Dean's just summary of the *pros* and *cons* of monasticism:—

'Glancing back upon the conventual history which, side by side with that of the bishops, we have endeavoured to trace, we observe many of those faults and corruptions, which operated elsewhere, no less than at Norwich, to ensure the downfall of the conventual system. Our convent had its full share of factious and aggressive monks, ever ready for a broil with the citizens; perhaps somewhat less than its share of studious and literary monks, the name of Bartholomew Cotton being the only one which stands out in high relief, as one of those monastic chroniclers, who, with all their inaccuracies and errors, have furnished, in their unsophisticated and artless narratives, the materials of future history. But there can be no doubt that at Norwich, as elsewhere, monasticism did the work, which in the order of God's providence it was designed to do, with more or less of efficiency. In a time of general turbulence and lawlessness, it furnished a retreat from the world, its vanities, and its cares, to many a devout soul, which aspired to a nearer communion with God, and to many a penitent soul, which, under the shadow of the convent, became devout. In a time when no right was recognised but that of the strongest, and no arm of the law shielded the oppressed from the oppressor, it made provision for, and offered a refuge to, the poor. In a time when the schoolmaster was not abroad, and even men of rank had of necessity to go without the rudiments of knowledge, it provided education for the young, and preserved literature. In dark and troublous days, it did the work, not of the Church only, but of the Poor Law, the printing press, and the school. And when the course of God's providence

¹ *Mediæval Preachers and Preaching*, Introduction, xxiv.

had raised up other agencies to do this work, monasticism, having in it the seeds of its own dissolution—an organic complaint, which a long career of prosperity had developed (here and there) into very appalling forms—collapsed, not so much by an Act of Parliament, as in the course of God's providence and of human affairs. It had done a noble work: it had been productive of many blessings to mankind; but it was now a garment which the mind of the age had outgrown, and which was therefore inevitably thrown aside, as unfitted for further use. The substantial benefits, which in its day it conferred upon mankind, now reach us through other channels—channels not (it may be) so picturesque, not so poetical, not so invested with æsthetic beauty; but, equally with monasticism, God's instruments, for which He is to be honoured, blessed, and praised.'

And Archbishop Trench, too, in his *Lecture on Monasticism*, holds the scales very fairly between the evils and gains of the monastic orders, and makes some forcible remarks on what is a rather thread-bare subject.

'Imagine the Monastic Orders withdrawn, and, as a period of Church history with characteristic features of its own, the Middle Ages would simply cease to exist.'

And again, speaking of the inseparability of good and evil in the Church:

'These cloisters were, in Montalembert's judgment, training places for the strong, where what was most vigorous in the Church's life was to be found; where the men were moulded and fashioned, who should afterwards rule the Church, or convert the world.'

While

'Chateaubriand bestowed on them the praise, that they furnished a refuge and retreat for the weary and sick of heart. . . .'

The Benedictine Rule had been adopted over the entire West, and although

'its glory was eclipsed by the greater glory of Clugny, an Order was founded at the close of the eleventh century, which should exercise a far stronger influence on the Church's life than any. From Clairvaux, by him made famous for ever, S. Bernard ruled, for some five-and-twenty years, not merely the Order which derived its chief lustre from him, but (it is hardly too much to say) the whole Western Church.'

In the midst of this lustre Herbert's days were cast. No wonder, then, at the terms in which he conceived of his Order.

And yet what an enigma is poor human nature still, notwithstanding all the investigations it has received! Here are men, who were regenerating mankind, dissatisfied with the pre-

sent, panting after a higher, standard, masters and custodians of the literature of the day ; and yet stooping to practise stratagems and puerile tricks which would shame a school-boy, and engaged in murderous broils which would disgrace a professed ruffian. Take, *e.g.*, their 'blood-letting,' the account of which would be only too ludicrous, if it were not on so serious a matter (and perhaps the best way of treating it is in the calm irony of Dr. Goulburn); their 'accidia;' and their conflicts with the citizens.

'There was a great blood-letting of the whole community five times a year (*viz.*, at the penitential seasons). Such a *penchant* did the monks seem to have for it, that ordinances were passed, forbidding it oftener than at the prescribed seasons; one is curious to know why blood-letting should be such an acceptable operation, that it matched ill with a season of humiliation. Special exemptions, however, were granted to those who submitted to it. They were not obliged to attend Church or Chapter. They might eat meat (and they did eat it, it appears, very voraciously!) They had *mixtum* (*negus?*) and were allowed the luxury of a fire.' (And the Dean bethinks him here again of 'poor Orderic,' and his sympathetic nature would almost pardon him, if he had been found among the counterfeits.) 'The consequence of the exemptions was, that the less spiritual often shammed ill. They drew their cowls over their heads, and went hobbling about with a stick, until the abbots and priors relented; and they were consigned to the infirmary and the barber, who was the blood-letter general to the community!'

Then the poor monks were much tormented with a natural, but very disagreeable besetting sin, 'accidia,' a compound of *ennui*, apathy, low spirits, and indolence.

'Accidie,' says Chaucer,¹ 'is the anguish of a trouble herte. . . . Certes, this is a damnable sinne, for it doth wrong to Jesu Crist, in as moche as it benimeth (taketh away) the service that men shulde do to Crist with alle diligence, as sayth Salomon: but accidie doth non suche diligence. He doeth all thing with annoye and with wrawness (peevishness), slaknesse and excusation, with idelnesse and unlust. Accidie is enemy to heryng (praising) and adoring of God . . . to labour in praying to God for amendement of sinnes . . . to works of penitence, for he loveth no businesse at all. Now certes, this foule sinne of accidie is eke a ful gret enemy to the livelode of the body; for it ne hath no purveaunce agenst temporel necessitee; for it forsleutheth (*i.e.*, putteth off), forsluggeth (neglecteth) and detroieth all goodes temporel by recchelesnesse. . . . Of accidie cometh that a man is annoied and accombred to do any goodnesse, and that maketh that God hath abhominacion of suiche accidie, as sayth John. . . .'

And then the *pros* of the monastic system must be still

¹ *The Person's Tale.*

further and largely discounted, at Norwich as elsewhere, by the discreditable brawls which were for ever cropping up between the monks and citizens—'town and gown rows' on a large scale. These appear to have originated in the jealousy of the City of the rights of the Priory, under their grant of a fair, to receive from it dues for selling at Tombland, and an impatience on the restrictions thus placed on trade, which engendered a fierce hatred by 'the busy trader against the indolent monk,' until the dissensions culminated in the year 1272 under the Episcopate of Bishop Skerning. He, shutting himself up in his palace, instead of arbitrating between the contending parties, tacitly encouraged the monks; while they on their part, when the fray was at its height, whenever they caught sight of a peaceful citizen obliged to pass their gates in proceeding to his daily work, ruthlessly shot him down, and left his body to rot where it fell. And so this murderous contest went on, till fire added its horrors to those of the sword. The Cathedral was in flames, and nothing was left of that beautiful church except the bare walls, and Bishop Suffield's Lady Chapel at the eastern extremity. Then began in right earnest the work of slaughter and revenge on the City's part. As soon as the maddened citizens forced the entrance which the fire had made for them, clerks, sub-deacons, and laymen alike were slain in the cloister and sacred precinct, and many more were dragged forth, to avoid the scandal, only to be put to death in the street!

Well may Dean Goulburn exclaim upon this part of his History that 'the conferences at that time held in the Chapter House were a bitter sarcasm on the monastic profession. Under sheep's clothing of the cowl and girdle, what wolves were there!'

Three subjects, which then greatly interested society, are elaborated in Herbert's *Sermons*. Firstly, that which, for want of a better word, we will call Hyper-symbolism. Secondly, the High Eucharistic Theory, which was then coming into vogue, and was in the ascendant. Thirdly, the *Cultus* of the Virgin Mary. Each of these calls for some remark.

In the sighing of every leaf and the plashing of every wave, Herbert found an allegory. And in this he has been followed by others in our own days, notably so, we think, by Bishop Wordsworth. Let us take a few examples. The 'pigeon' must needs set forth the 'busy intercourse of active life,' and the turtle the 'lofty heights of contemplative life.' Isaiah's magnificent injunctions to 'buy wine and milk' (the choice products of the Land of Promise, which *he* properly

allegorises as typical of the Gospel dispensation), must be strained to mean the 'Law,' by the more acrid taste of the one, and the milder precepts of the Gospel, by the other. The beautiful Epistle for Innocents' Day cannot tell its own tale, and read a simple lesson of purity, without the '144,000 redeemed ones' meaning the 'whole body of the Apostolical or Primitive Church,' and without the "'women" standing for the "woman" who sits upon the scarlet-colored beast' (whoever that may be).

The 'six waterpots' of the Cana marriage—this application is supported by the high authority of S. Augustine—must signify the six ages in which the world's history is to be comprised; and the 'water' from them is the 'teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the ages.' The 'ass's' foal, in Genesis xlix. 10, means the Gentiles unbroken to the yoke of the Law; the 'vine,' the Jewish Church; 'the wine,' Christ's garments; 'the redness of his eyes,' the holy joy of his people at Pentecost; and 'the whiteness of his teeth with milk,' the finding suitable nourishment for babes. 'The five smooth stones,' which David chose for his sling, mean the Pentateuch with which our Lord rebuked the Tempter; John the Baptist's Day (June 24) symbolises (again with S. Augustine) the natural decrease of the Solar day, because he had said, 'He must increase, but I must decrease;' and Zachariah's dumbness represents the 'silence of priest and prophet, when prophecy was about to be fulfilled in Christ;' and the prophecy of Moses that 'Benjamin in the morning should eat the prey and in the evening divide the spoil,' is Saul stoning Stephen, and in the evening of his day preaching the Faith. Most of these are familiar. It was a stranger use of allegory to say, that the Unjust Steward of the Parable typified (in some way which Dr. Goulburn himself, 'with the utmost straining of his eyes, cannot follow') S. Paul's career after his conversion—that to 'write fourscore' is to preach the Faith concerning the Resurrection, which shall come to pass in the eighth age of the world.

Dr. Neale, with his usual acuteness, perceives and deals with this difficulty, though we wish he had grappled with the crucial question of the limits to which mystical interpretation may be lawfully carried, 'with which the primitive and mediæval sermons overflow.' He admits, however, that there can scarcely be a doubt that 'in some later writers it has overstepped all possible bounds of moderation,' and then follow these apologetic remarks for the system:—

'If it be once granted that it is at all allowable, who can presume to set bounds to its exercise? It is remarkable, as Dr. Pusey observes, that in Psalms which, after deep thought, *we* can see to be partially applicable to our Lord, we find S. Augustine declaring, almost as if by intuition, "This Psalm breathes altogether of Christ." Surely, however far mediæval mysticism may have been carried, it is, to use the Evangelical term, more in accordance with the mind of the Spirit, than that harsh and rigid canon of Calvin's, which so many of his followers receive and applaud. It is, he taught, unsafe to find a type of Christ anywhere, except when it is pointed out to us in the New Testament. . . . Mediæval preachers, indeed, knew perfectly well, that such interpretations are powerful engines, as all sermons ought to be. They knew with how much force such a text as "But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore" speaks to the heart, when the morning is interpreted of the Resurrection, and the shore, of the harbour of everlasting rest after the waves of this troublesome world. They knew what beauty is thrown round the verse, "With my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands," when the Cross and the River of death and the preserved angels and restored man are typified by it. And if in any instance mediæval preaching pushed these interpretations to extravagance, it is surely better that we should see Christ everywhere, with Cocceius, than that we should see Him nowhere, with Grotius.'

He would, we suppose, endorse to the full that which the late Mr. Keble has so beautifully expressed in verse:—

'Two worlds are ours, 'tis only sin
Forbids us to descry
The mystic heaven and earth within,
Plain as the earth and sky.

'Thou who hast given us eyes to see
And love this sight so fair,
Give me a heart to find out Thee,
And read Thee *everywhere*.'

After all, considering that as yet all the Christian centuries have developed no criterion on this vexed question, we suppose that it must be left for some time longer to the combined action of the spiritual mind and Christian common-sense, acting under rigid allegiance to the *analogy of the Faith*.

The Eucharistic problem, alone of the great questions of the early Church, had not been dogmatically solved by it.

'Strangely and, as it proved, most unfortunately it was the one notable exception. But matters could not always continue in this state. It was inevitable that sooner or later the Church would have

to pronounce what it meant by that Presence, which evidently might mean so much or so little.¹

Accordingly it did so, stamping the doctrine with the name of Transubstantiation, at the fourth Lateran Council, in 1215. But it was not till the eighth century, that a private thinker, Pascal Radbere, boldly broached it, and not until the eleventh, that that view was ably contested by Berengarius, of Tours. Thenceforth it may be said to have been the apple of discord among the whole Christian world. Herbert of Losinga found the controversy raging in its height, and he threw the whole weight of his name and influence into what was then called the 'orthodox' scale, and his sermon on Easter is full of it. From a command so simple and so beautiful, what a world-wide controversy has arisen! A piece of bread is by Him, who is all truth and power, said to be His body, and, therefore, *must* be His body. A cup of wine is by Him said to be His blood, and, therefore, *must* be His blood. His flesh is by Him declared to be meat indeed, and His blood to be drink indeed, and, therefore, *must* be meat and drink. With all the authority of an impeccable legislator He assures His disciples that 'except they eat His flesh, they have no life in them;' and that 'whoso eateth His flesh dwelleth in Him, and He in him.' Felt virtue goes out of Him; a change comes over the whole soul of the recipient. Every candid man's conscience tells him experimentally that the right reception is not commemorative only. Visions of heavenly things then, and then chiefly, steal across us. Is not this enough? what matters all the rest? Hundreds of thousands have gone to their long homes, or returned to the duties of life, braced by the reception, and yet must it be curiously asked, *by those who can never answer their own question*, in what sense and to what extent are these grand sayings true? Surely, as if to rebuke and forestall these captious interrogators, and to lead off the mind to higher verities, our Lord replied to a similar objection—'How can this man give us His flesh to eat?'—by reiterating the command, and by asking another question, 'What and if ye shall see' (a still greater wonder) 'the Son of Man ascending up where He was before?'

The ever-virginity (*ἀειπαρθενία*) of the Virgin Mary was another favourite topic in the Middle Ages. There is a curious symbol of this attribute in an escutcheon in the eastern window of Cirencester Church. Three white flowers

¹ Trench's *Lectures on Mediæval Church History*, 1878.

arranged triangle-wise on the top of one green-lily stalk signify her purity in her three states of *Virgo*, *Mater*, and *Vidua*, before, during, and after, the Birth of our Lord. It is in allusion to this that Chaucer writes¹:—

‘Wherefore in laude, as I can best and may,
Of Thee and of the White Lilly floure,
Which that Thee bare, *and is a maide alway*,
To Tell a storie I wol do my labour.’

And as to the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is only true to say, that whoever would take a just view of his country, as it then was, must not call it un-English, though it was Roman. If he does, the following fine passage from Dr. Rock will undeceive him, and give him some idea of what the national *furor* was, in favour of Her whom ‘all generations’ were to ‘call blessed’ :—

‘In England time was when notes of praise arose from earth to heaven at the first streak of dawn, not only from wood and wild, poured forth by soulless birds of the air, but there went up strains too of worshipping and thankful song from out the thronged city and the busy town, and from out the smallest village. Time was, when the chiming of S. Mary’s bells at waking day awakened men, and bade them come to the House of God and sing His praises, and, like the Cherubin and Seraphin, cry out to one another, “Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth!” and ask the intercession of the mother who once bore that Son of David in her womb. If, like the Anglo-Saxon, the Norman and the English called upon all God’s-hallows—all the Saints above—for their prayers, like the Anglo-Saxon too, did they, while doing so, more especially single one from among that happy crowd in heaven, the spotless mother of our Redeemer, to help them by Her intercession. Like the rest of Christendom, Catholic England, besides singing the praises of Mary, kept, as the Anglo-Saxons used, several days of the year holy in Her remembrance. It did more, for while in almost every cathedral and large college, establishment or minster, S. Mary’s Mass, or Mass offered up to God in honour of the Blessed Virgin, was every morning sung at earliest dawn with all ritual solemnity, accompanied by the organ and choristers chanting the sweetest and most learned music of those times, known under the name of descant or pricksong—many a little parish church had supplied to it, by the devotion of its people, its own Mary-Mass priest, who offered up daily the holy sacrifice for this same purpose. Hence, however small the holy pile, it had its altars in honour of the Virgin. In our cathedrals and larger minsters, the warm love for the Mother of our Lord gave rise to an architectural feature in the building, as beautiful as it was beseechingly, and almost peculiar to England. At the furthest end, behind both choir

¹ *The Prioress’s Tale.*

and high-altar, stood, and yet stands, what to this day is called the Lady Chapel, in most instances a lightsome and comely work, meet emblem of Her, the morning star of our Redemption. But if day dawn began so, and twilight ended, by prayers put up to Christ in reverence of His beloved Mother (for our people loved to flock and hear sung in sweet music an evening hymn to the Virgin at Her altar in Her chapel, or beside Her image, that at such times usually had burning before it five tapers, indicative of Her five joys¹), in our Universities this same heart-softening devotion was as fondly cherished, but followed in another, though not less striking manner. Often the inmates of colleges there were, by the founder's statutes, required to meet together in their hall every Saturday evening, and upon the eve of every festival of the Blessed Virgin, and chant the anthem of that season in her honour. So liked, indeed, throughout the land was this religious practice, that among those things taught the poorest children at every village school, one was to learn by heart the words of the "*Alma Redemptoris Mater*," and the "*Salve Regina*," and to sing the music of those beautiful hymns.

'Whilst this country's belief was one, the symbols of religion, instead of being locked up in our churches, were spread abroad on the hill-top, beneath the greenwood shade, nigh the field path, by the highway, towards the hamlet's end, upon the bridge, at the street's corner, in the middle of the market-place, everywhere; not broken, not dishonoured, but adorned and revered. Among such outward tokens of this land's old Christian faith, those representing Mary were neither the fewest nor the least honoured.'²

Nor was this all. More churches were dedicated to Her than to any other Saint. Her name still lingers more than any others among the flowers of our fields. The '*Lady-Smock*' is the earliest of our wild annuals; it is the '*Lady's Bed-Straw*' that perfumes our down-lands. The '*Rose (of) Mary*' is still among the most fragrant, as the '*Mary-Gold*' is among the gaudiest, in our gardens. We have the '*Maiden-Hair*' fern, and the '*Lady's-Slipper*.' The rose, but particularly the snow-drop, which blooms about the Feast of the Purification, and the white-lily, were Her emblems; the former, always typical of the blood of martyrs, speaking of Her more than martyrdom, when the 'sword pierced through Her soul'; the two latter, characteristic of spotless purity. Almost every district had, and has, its '*Lady-grove*,' its '*May-field*,' its '*Lady-mead*,' and its '*Mary-well*.'

'Even the hind, though he owned neither mead, nor field, nor grove to christen with Her name, could and did choose the flowers that grew there for his symbols; culling the "*Virgin's-bower*"—which

¹ Of Her conception, delivery, and assumption; His resurrection and ascension.

² *Church of our Fathers*, vol. iii. p. 278.

is said to begin to bloom on August 15 (the anniversary of Her Assumption)—and the "Lady's-mantle" to grace his cottage walls with, or setting up on his chimney-piece, as spells against fire, if only called by Her name, dried branches of sea-weed, which he named with the name of "Lady-trees."¹

It is no exaggeration to say, that the greatest Transformation scene in our Reformation was, not the rejection of the Papal supremacy, nor even the suppression of the monasteries, but—the abolition of the *Cultus*. Henceforth she was to be no longer the Queen of Heaven, but the 'most blessed among women.' We might miss her, and she was no doubt missed in England (for to this day few things strike the young traveller on his first venture on the Continent so much as her roadside images with their coronets of flowers, or the prostrate crowds before her shrine in some Normandy Cathedral), but so it was, and the change was made.

Granting, however, that the image of a *created* being does not diminish our reverence or shock our instincts, the same remark does not apply to many of the Boss sculptures in Dean Goulburn's volume. To attempt, *e.g.*, to delineate the Almighty Father in human form and garb, crowned and vested in alb, stole, and cope, whether in the sublime occupation of creating the sun, moon, and stars, or in that of forming Eve out of Adam, 'where the upper part of the person of Eve is seen emerging under the hand of the Creator from Adam's side, He holding her right hand in His left, and with His right seeming to give the *fiat* for her creation, even if it be not contrary to the plain declaration of Scripture that 'no man hath seen God at any time,' is surely opposed to the spirit of that commandment that He who is a spirit should be worshipped, and therefore dwelt on in imagination, in 'Spirit'—which is 'Truth;' and may well extract from Dr. Goulburn the regret that 'human art should presume to delineate the awful form of Him whom no man hath seen nor can see.' And the same remarks apply to the three figures representing the Persons of the Blessed Trinity, however fitting it may be that 'the revelation of the Triune God being the sum and substance of all revelations, a series of sculptures devoted to scattered events of sacred history should, at their close, contain some reference to the Holy Trinity.'

To such refinement, however, was this system of delineation brought, that distinct attributes and emblems were assigned to each Person, on which Lady Eastlake observes—

¹ *Church of our Fathers*, vol. iii. p. 208.

'It would appear that as soon as art ventured to represent the First Person under the form of a man, the perfect equality and similitude of the Three was, as a natural consequence, immediately arrived at ; but art, whose great charge it is, in imitation of her great original, Nature, to make no one being exactly like another, has gone so far as to distinguish the Third Person by a more youthful aspect. To the First Person, for instance, is given the Globe, to the Second the Cross, to the Third the Book. Only in one particular exemplification of the mystery do these attributes vanish before the attempt to establish a perfect identity. This occurs in a series of the Creation where God says, "Let us make man in our *image*."'¹

With greater pleasure do we join in the praises, so frequent in the pages of Bishop Herbert, of celibacy.

We can enter into the feelings of those who, regarding matter, if not as the root of evil, yet as the great clog on the development of the spiritual life, and especially carnal pleasures, as those which, 'warring most against the soul,' assail the young man in his youth, and pursue even the old to their graves—long to expel them from the whole category of human affairs, and to imitate our Lord to the letter. Well might Herbert exclaim—

'A virgin was Christ ; a virgin was Mary ; a virgin was John, the herald of Christ ; a virgin was John, the beloved of Christ. Attend, and thou shalt find that everywhere in the mystery of our redemption, virginity hath had the utmost efficacy.'

We can admire and envy the life of those who are free from this burden of the flesh ; free, either because so 'born from their mother's womb,' or because 'they have made themselves' free, 'for the kingdom of heaven's sake.' As the unmarried virgin in S. Paul's opinion ranked above the matron, the one caring only 'how she might please her husband,' the other how she might live for God—so does the monastic theory in nothing more engage our admiration than in this one of its triple vows. It is as Christ-like as Obedience, and more saintly than Poverty.

The boy martyrdoms, at Norwich and elsewhere, are a favourite theme with Dean Goulburn ; and no wonder, for there is something very harrowing in the sufferings of the young, and something very heroic in their first resolve for religion. There was 'Sweet Hugh of Lincoln,' a martyr at eight, S. William of Norwich at seven, S. Simon of Trent at two-and-a-half. But can martyrdom begin so early ? Determined indomitable will is the soul of martyrdom. But is ever a

¹ *History of our Lord*, ii. 346.

soul so *set* at the age of two-and-a-half? It may be said, on the other hand, the very pliancy of a child's will constitutes him the truer martyr. If a *child* hold out even unto death against this natural tendency, he must be made of noble stuff indeed.

This spirit of martyrdom in youth comes out very finely in Chaucer's 'littel S. Nicolas,' sitting 'in the scole-room' and hearing the 'Alma Redemptoris' sung.

"And is this song makéd in reverence
Of Christes moder?" said this innocent;
"Now certes I wol don my diligence,
To conne it all, or Christmasse be went;
*Though that I for my primere shal be shent
And shall be beten thries in an hour.*"¹
I wol it conne, our Ladie for to honour."¹

And then there are the reputed miracles of the boy-martyrs' tombs, which leads to the interesting question of the cessation of miracles—a question far too complicated to be touched upon in a single sentence at the close of an article.

We should not have pursued these subjects so far, were it not that the text of Bishop Herbert's sermons is so largely illustrated by notes by Dr. Goulburn, of the biblical and critical learning of which it is difficult to convey an adequate idea to the reader; although we hope that in any future edition a few (to which we need not now more particularly allude) may be omitted for the sake of prurient readers, who may misapprehend their object. It may suffice to say, that the school and college groundwork, and the Rugby maturity, of his scholarship, together with the patristic and theological knowledge of his still riper years, seem here gathered to a focus. And it is imparted with the freshness of his first successful ventures at Eton, Balliol, and Merton, some forty years ago. He also possesses the rare art of never using a word or phrase without immediately explaining it, if it requires explanation. This is a great charm to the reader, and gives great lucidity to his style. He is also a keen lover of Archæology; and as Archæology is the Handmaid, even if it is not more rightly called the Mother, of History, so it is capable of being pressed, and has been pressed, by him into his service on the present occasion most advantageously; and he has given us much useful antiquarian lore on matters not merely local. Indeed it would be true to say, that his work is designed to be a piece of Archæology in an enlarged Historical

¹ *The Prioress's Tale.*

and Biographical shape, intended to present a sketch of mediæval life, manners, literature, and art, as well as of the individual character of his Bishop.

We say that if it had not been for these editorial condiments, we should not have carried our enquiries so far. For the truth is, that these subtle distinctions, whether they relate to the *Cultus* of the Virgin, or to the delineations of Deity, or to the more transcendental subjects of our Lord's Incarnation, and the Eucharist, are (to our mind) painful to dwell on, and tend to lessen the reverence which should attach to them. The verities are far too awful for human ingenuity to grapple with, or speculate upon—for speculations any researches upon them must always remain—and the moment we advance, and press, an argument upon things beyond our comprehension, that moment we practically avow them to be *within* it, and if within it, then within our right and competency to pronounce judgment upon them.

We think we need say no more to recommend the above works to our readers (especially, in the case of the Norwich works, to our Norfolk and Suffolk readers), nor can we refrain from paying a tribute of thanks for ourselves, in conclusion, to their accomplished authors for the halo which they have so successfully shed in them over the fast-fading glories of Mediævalism.

ART. VI.—THE TALMUD.

1. SELDEN, *De Synedriis*. (London, 1650.)
2. RELAND, *Antiquitates Sacræ*. (Trajecti Batav., 1717.)
3. VITRINGA, *De Synagogâ Vetere*. (Leucopetræ, 1726.)
4. LIGHTFOOT'S *Works*. (London, 1823.)
5. *Mishna Treatises*. By DA SOLA and RAPHAEL. (London, 1845.)
6. *Sayings of the Hebrew Fathers*. By CHARLES TAYLOR. (Cambridge, 1877.)
7. *The Talmud*. By JOSEPH BARCLAY. (London, 1878.)

THE study of the *Talmud* has, for various reasons, been long neglected by Christian scholars. Since the days of Lightfoot, scarcely an effort has been made to penetrate its recesses, and, until within a very recent period, no one has attempted to present to the public any portion of it in an English dress.

The partial success which attended the labours of the scholar of the Commonwealth, did not afford much encouragement to others to follow his example, and since his day, little use has been made of Talmudical authorities to illustrate Scriptural doctrine, or the usages which prevailed among the Jews in New Testament times. Thirty-five years ago, seventeen treatises of the *Mishna* were published in English by two Jewish Rabbis, but the work, on the face of it, was untrustworthy, and it attracted little notice. The publication of the *Sayings of the Hebrew Fathers* by Mr. Taylor, being a translation of the ninth treatise of the fourth order of the *Mishna*, with an elaborate commentary, was the first real attempt in modern times to give the English public a small, but very important portion of Talmudic literature. The follies and wisdom of the Rabbis, their superstitions and strange interpretations of Scripture, their anticipations or adaptations of New Testament truth, and the remarkable agreement in some cases between their language and that of Scripture, show that the *Talmud* is not deserving of the contempt from which it has hitherto suffered, and lead to the belief that much more remains, equally deserving of the attention of scholars. This belief is strengthened by Dr. Barclay's work, which was published in the beginning of last year. It contains only seventeen of the sixty-three treatises of the *Mishna*, including the treatise on the Fathers. The translation of it generally agrees with Mr. Taylor's version, but the discrepancies are sufficiently marked to show that the two scholars worked on independent principles. In the other treatises, the extreme sententiousness of the Jewish Rabbis frequently renders the meaning obscure, and there are numerous passages, unintelligible to a reader not acquainted with the literature and style of the *Talmud*, and with usages referred to in it, which need elucidation. It is, however, the most effectual effort ever made in England, to enable ordinary readers to form a correct conception of what the *Mishna* really is. It shows how wide is the difference between the sacred literature of the Jews, and the weak and quibbling writings of the Rabbis in later ages. It is a valuable contribution to our hitherto limited knowledge of Talmudical literature, and will do much to stimulate a desire for further information.

The *Mishna* embodies the Jewish traditions, legal, social, and ecclesiastical, which for several hundred years had been orally transmitted. Two centuries after the Christian era they were finally reduced into a written code by Rabbi Judah the Holy; the work, as compiled by him, being the text of the

Talmud of Babylon. The commentaries upon it, called the *Ghemara*, were published later. These two sources afford a comparatively distinct view of the condition of the Jews shortly before the disruption of their nation, as regards the administration of justice, their religious system as distinguished from the Temple services, the controversies and usages of contending sects, and the opinions of the educated classes. On many questions mistakes have been made, arising from superficial or imperfect knowledge, and successive writers have frequently taken for granted the statements of their predecessors, from inability or unwillingness to have recourse to the original authority. Mistakes can be rectified, wherever there are direct statements in the *Talmud*, but in some cases, it presupposes a familiarity with institutions then actually existing, and a consequent obscurity arises, which is only partially cleared away by the light of later Rabbinic writings.

The fourth treatise of the fourth order of the *Mishna* on the Sanhedrim, casts a flood of light upon the judicial system in general, and upon the details of its administration, in respect to jurisdiction, evidence, crimes, and punishments. The antiquity of the traditions embodied in it, appears from the absence of any reference to the Roman interference with the Great Sanhedrim's infliction of capital punishment, for the regulation of which there are special directions, as well as a catalogue of the crimes for which it was the penalty.

Tribunals for the administration of justice were of three sorts. The first was a court consisting of three judges, who exercised jurisdiction in both civil and criminal cases of minor importance, and in other matters. They seem in some circumstances, and for particular purposes, to have been a standing committee of the greater Sanhedrims, but in others they were chosen from the larger body, to adjudicate in minor causes by the litigants themselves. One was selected by each, and the judges thus chosen nominated a third. Either plaintiff or defendant might object to the person selected by the other, on the ground of relationship, because no relative of any of the persons concerned could be allowed to act as a judge, or to give evidence, or on the ground of the want of character. The qualifications for membership of a Sanhedrim were experience and a reputation for justice, but these were supposed to include mercy, religion, hatred of bribery, and love of truth and of mankind. Gamblers, usurers, betting men, and those who carried on trades in the Sabbatical year, whether voluntarily or under foreign compulsion, were inadmissible either as judges or witnesses, but any other Jew, whether priest, Levite,

or private person, was not debarred from the hope of obtaining a seat on the tribunal of justice. The court of three judges exercised jurisdiction in civil causes, in cases of robbery and assault, forcible restraint, enticement and slander, in the appointment of elders, who seem to have been the judges selected to fill vacancies in the Sanhedrims, and among officers of the synagogues, and striking off the heifer's neck (Deut. xxi. 4), in the custom of loosing the shoe (Deut. xxv. 9), and in certain cases of immorality. Questions about the produce of the fourth year (Lev. xix. 24), about the valuation of the second tithes (Deut. xiv. 22 and xxvi. 14), of holy (Lev. xxvii. 2) and moveable things, and the valuation of a slave, in which cases it was necessary that one judge should be a priest, about the insertion of the intercalary year and month,¹ and the power of inflicting stripes, were within their control. In pecuniary causes, after the court had been cleared, the witnesses were called in and examined separately, after being duly cautioned to speak the truth. When all the evidence had been received, the judges consulted together, and the president gave judgment in presence of both plaintiff and defendant. Each member of the court was strictly prohibited from divulging for which party he had given his voice, because it was said, 'Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer among my people' (Lev. xix. 16), and 'the tale-bearer revealeth secrets' (Prov. xi. 13). Execution of sentence was stayed for thirty days, during which the defeated party might bring further evidence with the view of reversing the judgment; and the judges were allowed to reverse their decision. If necessary, the court might sit on into the night, but it might not separate till a decision had been arrived at.

The Sanhedrim of the second class consisted of twenty-three judges. It could only be established in a city where there were, according to one authority, one hundred and twenty persons of sufficient importance to discharge official duties, but according to another, two hundred and thirty, to represent twenty-three overseers of tens. In order to supply vacancies, there were three classes of probationers, each consisting of twenty-three persons specially selected from the citizens, and whenever a new judge was required, he that sat highest in order was transferred to the tribunal, his place being filled by the next in seniority. The place left vacant at the bottom of the third class, was filled by the selection of

¹ Authority to appoint the intercalary year and month, as required by the Jewish calendar, was entrusted only to a sub-committee of three of the Great Sanhedrim, the President being always a member.

a fresh probationer ; so that the slow process of advancement prevented any person of immature years from attaining the rank of a judge in a provincial city. The tribunal was semi-circular, that the judges might be able to observe each other, and the probationers sat in front of them in three rows, parallel to the chord of the arc, the person who had been last selected occupying a place by himself. The court had two secretaries, one to record convictions, and the other sentences of acquittal. There were in Jerusalem two secondary Sanhedrims, one of which sat in a building in front of the gate Shushan, or eastern gate of the Mountain of the House, and the other in the court of the women, outside the gate Nicanor, or gate of the Court of Israel.

The Sanhedrim of twenty-three exercised both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and possessed in certain cases the power of inflicting the capital penalty. They could pass sentence of death upon persons guilty of unnatural crimes, and upon the owner of the ox known to be vicious, which had gored a man or a woman to death (Ex. xxi. 29). None were eligible as judges in capital cases except priests, Levites, and those who were allowed to intermarry with the priesthood.

The supreme court of the nation was the Great Sanhedrim, consisting of seventy-one members. The *Talmud* traces its origin to the council of Moses in the wilderness, spoken of in Numbers xi., but the name being of foreign origin, seems to imply rather, that it was established during the Greek occupation of Palestine, immediately before the age of the Maccabees. It included both a lay and ecclesiastical element. The qualifications required for a judge of the Great Sanhedrim were numerous and varied. Besides an accurate knowledge of the law, he was to be acquainted with the different branches of information necessary for its elucidation. Medicine, astronomy, astrology, magic, sorcery, and the different phases of idolatry had to be learned. The Jews having come into contact with other nations, it became necessary for him to understand foreign languages, to avoid any necessity for interpreters. He was also to be free from bodily defects, advanced in years, but not too old, that he might not be tempted to undue severity, and the father of a family, that he might be tender and compassionate. He that had the highest reputation for wisdom was elected President, under the title of Nasi or Prince, being supposed to represent Moses, and next in rank, sitting on his right hand, was the Vice-President, called Father of the House of Judgment. Vacancies were filled as in the secondary Sanhedrims, but none were eligible except persons

qualified to pronounce sentence in capital cases, so that the court was essentially sacerdotal. Wherever in the New Testament, priests, elders, and scribes are mentioned, this is the tribunal which is intended.

The Great Sanhedrim held its sittings in the chamber called in the *Talmud* Gazith, or the House of Hewn Stone, near the south-western corner of the Temple wall, within the boundary of the tribe of Judah. It was built by Simon Ben Shetach when President, in the time of Hyrcanus Jannæus the Asmonean, and stood partly in the court, and partly in the *chel* or terrace. The meetings were held in the section of the building outside the wall, because, except the king, no persons were permitted to sit in the consecrated place. When Jesus was brought before the Council, it had assembled in the house of the High Priest, from which it would appear, that it might meet in any other place than in Gazith. After holding its sittings there for a lengthened period, it removed elsewhere, forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, because, according to the Rabbis, having been deprived by the Romans of much of its power, it was unable to cope with the lawlessness and crime which began to prevail. This was the first of the ten 'sittings' which it is supposed to have made before its final suppression by the Emperor Constantine.

The Sanhedrim in Gazith was 'the foundation of the traditional law, and pillar of instruction' (1 Tim. iii. 15), and as such, it determined all questions arising throughout the kingdom, as the ultimate court. There lay an appeal from the tribunal of three to that of twenty-three in the same city, and from it to one of the lesser councils in Jerusalem, and from it to the other, and from this last to the Great Sanhedrim, whose decision was final. Cases of lesser importance were left to the inferior courts. Its authority was unquestioned, because it was believed to be the tribunal divinely appointed for the trial and determination of all matters of greater moment.

The jurisdiction of the court extended to all persons, and to certain social and political questions, which it alone was competent to decide. The king was at first under its control, but in consequence of the disturbance which arose when Jannæus was summoned before it, for causing the massacre of several thousand persons in the Temple, the law was altered, and all control over him was abandoned. He could not lawfully begin a foreign war, unless it had been previously sanctioned by the supreme court of seventy-one, nor could the army be set in motion without its approval. A High Priest might act as a judge, and be himself arraigned before this

tribunal. He might be a witness, and evidence might be given against him by others. If condemned, he might be sentenced to receive stripes, but afterwards the court was obliged to restore him to his dignity. A tribe which had lapsed to idolatry, and a false prophet, could be incriminated before it. No addition could be made to the Temple courts, nor could the area of Jerusalem be enlarged, except with its sanction. The appointment of local magistrates and of the judges of the secondary courts in general required its approval, which seems to have been given through a sub-committee of three. It could exclude cities from the civil and ecclesiastical privileges of the commonwealth, but not in more than two cases at once, and no town on the frontier could, for obvious reasons, be laid under this penalty.

The court assembled after the morning sacrifice, and continued in session till the evening. Criminal causes could only be heard and decided by day. Where the life of the accused was involved, he might be acquitted at once, but he could not be condemned until the second day, and no sentence could be passed on a Friday, or on the eve of a festival. Trials for capital offences could not be carried on by night. In each of these three particulars the Sanhedrim was guilty, when Jesus was arraigned before it, of a flagrant violation of its own rules. Whether the cause was civil or criminal, the judges were required to make a thorough investigation into its merits. 'Judgments in money open the case either for clearing or proving indebted, but judgments of souls open the case for clearing, and the case is not opened for condemning;' so that in the latter case, the opposite of the modern usage was followed, the trial being begun by proving the innocence of a person accused of a criminal offence, and not by producing evidence to obtain his conviction. This rule also was broken by the Sanhedrim at the trial of Jesus, when they 'sought for witness to put him to death.' In civil causes a majority of one was required, but in criminal, the accused could only be condemned by a majority of two, while one was sufficient for an acquittal. In criminal cases, when any person had been tried and found to be innocent, he could not again be brought into peril for the same offence. Each judge was allowed to express his opinion in favour of the accused, but, even though unanimous, all were not allowed to pronounce openly a sentence of condemnation. In trials where the penalty was death, the witnesses were cautioned in the most awful terms, and warned of the dreadful consequences which would ensue, if an innocent person should be condemned, after which they

were subjected to a strict cross-examination. They were required to state the Sabbatic year in which the offence had been committed, the year, the month, the day of the month, the day, the hour, the place, and in cases of idolatry, the name of the idol, and the matter of the sacrifice. Each judge was allowed to cross-examine in respect to the most minute particulars, and if two witnesses were found to contradict each other, the evidence of both was discredited. If the judges pronounced the accused not guilty, he was at once liberated, but if they doubted, a decision was not arrived at till the next day. During the intervening night they fasted, and discussed the question together. Having assembled early in the morning, each judge gave his vote, the secretaries being in readiness to correct any error into which they might fall in respect to the evidence. In the lesser Sanhedrims, no person could be condemned by less than thirteen votes, and in the greater by less than thirty-seven. If there was a majority of one only (as a vote for condemnation might be altered, but not the contrary), the discussion was continued till a member of the court changed his mind, and went over to the minority.

At the trial of the blasphemers, when the case had been clearly proved, the judges rose from their seats and, in token of their horror, rent their garments (Matt. xxvi. 65) which were never repaired again. The man who gave his seed to Molech was not considered guilty, till he had handed his child to the idol, and caused it to pass through the fire. When the Python spoke from the arm, it was considered a proof of the possession of a familiar spirit, while the words of a wizard were alone sufficient for his condemnation. A distinction was drawn between presumptuous and unintentional profanation of the Sabbath, the punishment of the former being cutting off, while the latter might be atoned for by a sin-offering. He that cursed his parents was not held to be guilty till he had cursed them by the name of God, but if he used a substituted name, the Rabbis were not agreed as to the nature of his offence. The enticer to idolatry was dealt with in an exceptional way. Of all the offenders who were liable to the penalty of death, he was the only one who might be convicted on the evidence of witnesses who had been placed in concealment to overhear his words and entrap him. The sorcerer who merely deluded the eyes, was not deemed to be guilty till it had been proved that he had committed an actual act of sorcery. The case of the stubborn and rebellious son was fenced round by so many qualifications and exceptions, that

his conviction was next to impossible. He could not be punished, unless both his father and his mother were agreed in bringing him before the Sanhedrim, neither, according to one Rabbi, if his parents were not suitably matched, was he liable to the penalty. If either of them were broken-handed, or lame, or dumb, or blind, or deaf, he could not be placed on his trial, because, in such a case, the requirements of the laws could not be literally fulfilled (Deut. xxi. 19, 20). His parents were to bring him in the first instance before the tribunal of three, and, having warned him in their presence, to flog him. If afterwards he returned to his evil habits, they were to arraign him before the Sanhedrim of twenty-three, and if condemned, he was to be punished in presence of the three before whom he had been first accused. If he could escape before the trial was finished, and remain away till the age of puberty, he was not liable to the penalty, but if he escaped after sentence was pronounced, even though he reached mature years, he was still amenable. The procedure in the case of a rebellious elder illustrates the difficulty which even the Jew felt in bringing home a charge of heretical teaching. If condemned by the Sanhedrim of his own city, the sentence was not regarded as final until confirmed by the supreme court at Jerusalem, after the cause had been heard in turn by each of the intermediate tribunals. Even though the accused were eventually condemned, he might return home, and continue to teach his opinions as before, without molestation, but as soon as he began to put them into practice, and to act upon them, he was seized and conveyed to Jerusalem, where he was detained in custody till a holiday, and then put to death. Letters were afterwards despatched to various places, announcing his execution. The opinions of the Sadducees show the difficulty of proving a charge of heresy, because, while in the *Talmud*, they are frequently called heretics by their opponents, there is no record of any of them ever having been punished. The disciple who practised the false teaching of the rebellious elder was not amenable to the law, because, what was a serious offence in the one, was held to be insignificant in the other.

The Sanhedrim could sentence a culprit to be executed by stoning, or burning, or beheading, or by strangling. Blasphemers, idolaters, those who sacrificed their children to Moléch, persons with familiar spirits, wizards, those who profaned the Sabbath, the man who cursed his father or his mother, or who seduced a betrothed woman, or who enticed to idolatry, or who withdrew to it from the congregation, sor-

cerers, and the stubborn and rebellious son, were stoned. The immoral daughter of a priest was to be burned. At first the culprit was surrounded with dry wood and literally burned alive, but afterwards, a lighted faggot was first thrust down the throat of the person who was sentenced to death in this way. Murderers and the inhabitants of a city which had apostatised to idolatry were to be beheaded, the city itself, with everything it contained, was to be destroyed, but, although it might never be rebuilt, the site might be laid out in pleasure-grounds. The man who beat his father or his mother, or who kidnapped an Israelite, the elder who rebelled against the judges, the false prophet, and he who prophesied in the name of idolatry, and witnesses who were proved to have given perjured evidence against a priest's daughter and her paramour, were strangled. Even after the accused had been condemned, further opportunities, while on the way to execution, were afforded, of producing evidence which might tend to establish his innocence, but if none were forthcoming, the sentence was carried into effect. There were two burial-places for condemned malefactors, one for those who were stoned and burned, and the other for those who were beheaded and strangled. After the burial, the relatives of the deceased were required to come to the court which had condemned him, and to ask after the welfare of the judges and witnesses, to show that they entertained no malice in their hearts, and that they admitted the justice of the sentence. They were to appear dejected, but no outward signs of mourning were permitted.

Even before the Romans had deprived the Sanhedrim of the power of inflicting capital punishment, the penalty had virtually fallen into abeyance. The rules of evidence had become so strict, and the distinctions laid down by the Rabbis so subtle, that it was almost impossible to secure convictions. Public opinion had been changing in the direction of greater mercy, and some went so far as to advocate the abolition of the death penalty altogether. If the Sanhedrim passed one capital sentence in seventy years, it was called the court of murderers. But in some cases the Jew was unmerciful, and a formal trial might be dispensed with, before inflicting summary justice. A thief who stole a vessel used in the Temple, the paramour of an Aramæan and a necromancer, might be destroyed without any trial. If a priest ministered in a state of legal uncleanness, the younger members of the sacerdotal order might drag him forth from the sacred precincts, and dash out his brains with pieces of wood. The stranger who ventured to officiate in the Temple was to be

strangled according to some, but according to others, he was to be left to the visitation of heaven.

In cases where human law could not reach offenders, the Jew, while taking to himself every advantage, was ready to debar others from all hope in the 'world to come,' by which expression the times of the Messiah were meant. While all true Israelites would have a portion in it, there were some to whom the blessing was denied. Those who denied that there was in the Law any reference to the resurrection of the dead, by whom the Sadducees were intended, or that the law was of divine origin, the Epicurean,—which seems to have been a term equally applicable to those who rejected the teaching of the Rabbis, and to the Christians,—the man who studied forbidden books, or who muttered over a wound, or who meditated upon the letters of the name Jehovah with a sinister intention, would all be excluded. Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi, Jeroboam and Manasseh, were left in the same state of exclusion. Notwithstanding the statement of Scripture that the repentance of the wicked king was accepted, the *Talmud* asserts that God 'brought him back to his kingdom, but not to life in the world to come.' The generations of the dispersion at the tower of Babel, and of the Deluge, the men of Sodom, the spies who brought the evil report, and the people who perished in the Wilderness, were also to be shut out from Messianic privileges, as also the inhabitants of a city which had fallen into idolatry, besides being liable to utter destruction.

The circumstances of the people after the return from the captivity, and the obligation of reading the law to keep up a knowledge of religion among those who lived too far from Jerusalem to attend the ordinary Temple services, necessitated other places of meeting for religious purposes. At what time synagogues became general is uncertain, but the form of the word suggests that of the successors of Alexander the Great, and it is to this period that the notices in the *Talmud* must be regarded as referring. It nowhere gives a detailed account of the organisation and ritual of the synagogue, because both are taken for granted as well known, so that what was sufficiently plain to contemporaries, is in some cases involved in an obscurity which can only be partially removed by the help of later authorities.

A synagogue might not be established except in a city where there were ten men of sufficient independence and leisure to form a congregation, and be always present at the stated times of prayer. A modern Jewish authority asserts

that they were paid for their attendance. The Rabbinic method of proving that a congregation could not consist of less than ten is singular. 'Whence know we that a congregation required ten? as it is said, How long shall I bear with this evil congregation?—(Numb. xiv. 27); Joshua and Caleb were excepted.' There were twelve spies, but when the two righteous men were omitted, ten remained. If a smaller number were present, there could be no reading of the Law or the Prophets, and no benedictions could be pronounced. At funerals no addresses could be delivered, and no blessings could be given at marriages. Afterwards the members of this body became the officers of the Synagogue, exercising both civil and ecclesiastical authority. The qualifications of members were, not so much social position and leisure, as a faculty of application and profound acquaintance with the law, because, 'those were accounted free who were engaged in the study of it, and whoever was so engaged, was exalted.' While the priesthood as a body was occupied with the Temple services, and in studying and teaching, men of other tribes arose from time to time, who became famous for their attainments, and who, along with them, filled the highest places in the Synagogues and Sanhedrims. Humility of origin was no bar to advancement, provided there were the necessary knowledge and qualifications.

Of the ten required to form a congregation, three, in the opinion of Lightfoot, formed the lesser Sanhedrim, with limited authority. Subject to the approval of the supreme court at Jerusalem, they appointed elders as vacancies occurred in the body, and exercised the power of inflicting stripes upon offenders (Matt. x. 17 and 2 Cor. xi. 24), with other functions. Next to them was the minister of the congregation, who was called 'the Overseer' and 'the Angel of the Church.' This was the elder who 'laboured in the word and doctrine,' regulating both the reading and expounding of Scripture. It was his duty to take the roll of the law from the Ark and hand it to the reader, and when the reading was finished, to return it to its place. He called upon each person who was appointed by the ruler of the synagogue to ascend the pulpit and read, and stood beside him to see that he made no mistakes. He blew the trumpet on the eve of the Sabbath, on the first day of the new year, when any person was excommunicated, and on fast days. In the larger synagogues he waved a banner, as a signal for the people to say 'Amen' at the appointed places in the prayers. This custom was borrowed from the Temple service at the daily sacrifice.

Whenever the High Priest ministered, at the moment when he was bowing down to pour out the libation, the Sagan, who was standing at the corner of the altar, waved the banners which he held in his hands, the cymbals were clanged, and the Levites intoned the chant, as signals to the people. The minister could not himself read the lessons for the day, unless he were specially appointed like any other reader. The 'ruler of the synagogue,' like Jairus and Crispus, both of whom from their names seem to have been Roman proselytes, appointed the persons who were to read, recite the Shema, and repeat the benedictions in front of the Ark. Three of the ten were deacons, or almoners, who attended to the wants of the poor, two collecting the alms, and the third distributing them. Having approved themselves in this office, they might afterwards be promoted to a higher function. The ninth member was the interpreter, who stood beside the reader, and translated the Hebrew into the vernacular, so as to enable the congregation to understand. The practice dates from the return from the captivity, when the sacred language had ceased to be spoken. During the reading of the law, the interpreter explained verse by verse, but the lesson from the Prophets might be rendered into Aramaic by three at a time. The Talmudical explanation of Nehemiah viii. 8 is:—'They read in the book of the law' (*i.e.* the reading) 'distinctly' (*i.e.* the interpreting), 'and gave the sense' (*i.e.* the explanation) 'and caused to understand the reading' (*i.e.* the Masoreth, or points and accents). It is supposed that the tenth member was an elder, who discoursed upon tradition in the interval of public worship. Every synagogue had two chambers, one called 'the House of the Book,' and the other 'the House of Doctrine.' In the former the Scriptures were read, and in the latter tradition was taught and expounded. Questions were proposed and answered, and disputations were carried on amid the approval or disapproval of the audience, who sat in front of the elder.

None of these officers were permitted to act till after they had been duly appointed and ordained. In the first instance, a public teacher selected a disciple whom he deemed worthy to be his successor, but in the time of Hillel the power was vested in the Sanhedrim exclusively. Before his ordination, a private person was simply called by the name of his father, as Ben Shammai, but after he had been publicly appointed, he was known by the title of his office, as Rabbi Joshua Ben Shammai. No title had been given to Ezra, or to any of the Prophets, who were simply called by their names, without any

prefix. The first to whom the distinctive title of Rabbi was applied, was Judah the Holy, the redactor of the *Mishna*, and the first who was called Rabban was Gamaliel, the president of the Sanhedrim, who transmitted the title to his successors. 'Rabbi is greater than Rab, and Rabban is greater than Rabbi, and he is greater who is called by his own name, than he who is called Rabban.' The candidate was ordained by the Sanhedrim laying their hands upon his head, with the words, 'Rabbi, behold thou art ordained.' Particular persons were set apart for distinct duties, one to expound the law, either in its totality or in some of its parts, another to act as a judge, either in civil or criminal cases, and so on. In no case was any person recognised as a teacher or judge, till after he had received public authority.

Synagogues were originally built in the fields, apart from other houses. In later times, the best sites in the cities and villages were chosen. As there were no dissenters, the number of them was sufficiently large to afford accommodation for the whole available population. The Rabbis, with their usual exaggeration, said that in Jerusalem there were four hundred and eighty. They were built east and west, and, like Christian churches, were divided into two parts, the upper, called 'the Temple,' where the Ark (containing the rolls of the law) was placed, and where the elders sat facing the people, and the lower, or body of the building, which was occupied by the congregation. In the middle, in a clear space, stood the pulpit, where the Law and the Prophets were read, and from which discourses were delivered.

Irrespective of holy-days, they were open for public worship on the Sabbath, and on the second and fifth days of the week. The two latter were supposed to have been appointed by Ezra, who also ordered that on these days the Sanhedrims in cities should hold their courts of justice. These were observed as fasts by strict Pharisees. When the Jews had left the synagogue at Antioch, the Gentiles entreated Paul and Barnabas, that on one of these days, the same subject might be resumed (Acts xiii. 42—in the *Sabbath between*—Marg.), and before the next ordinary seventh-day Sabbath.

The duty of resorting to the synagogues was strictly enjoined upon every Jew. The prayers of the congregation, it was said, were always heard, for even though sinners were present, God did not reject the petitions then presented to him. Private prayer, which it was possible might not always be heard, was discouraged, if there were opportunities of assembling in the synagogues. He that failed to attend both

morning and evening, or altogether neglected the claims of religion, was called 'an evil neighbour' (Jer. xii. 14). Even lepers, who might not enter the Temple, were not shut out, but precautions were taken against contact with them. This, however, referred only to synagogues in walled towns. No one might pass a synagogue during the time of prayer, unless carrying a burden, or unless there were several in the same place, because it might be supposed that if he were passing one he was going to another, or unless he were wearing the phylacteries, which would prove him not unmindful of the law. To encourage attendance on public worship, it is said in the *Talmud*:—'The Holy Blessed One saith, whosoever employeth himself in the study of the law, and in the returning of mercy, and whosoever prays with the synagogue, I account concerning him, as if he redeemed Me and My sons from the nations of the world.'

The phylacteries were supposed to be the same as the 'frontlets' mentioned in Ex. xiii. 16. The passages (Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18) believed to enjoin the use of them, were interpreted figuratively before the captivity, and so always by the Karaites or Scripturists, but the Rabbis insisted upon the literal meaning, and said that leathern phylacteries were to be worn on the forehead and left arm. The place for the frontlet was defined to be 'where the pulse of an infant's brain is.' They might not be made round without incurring guilt, because the Pharisaic tradition received from Moses would be thereby broken. Carrying them on any other part of the forehead than the spot prescribed, or on the hand (*ib.* v. 18) instead of the arm, as was done by the Sadducees, was deemed by the Pharisees evidence that the wearer was a heretic. The passages in the law which they contained were four: Ex. xiii. 1-10 and 11-16; Deut. vi. 4-9 and xi. 13-21. They were worn during the day at the time of prayer, and during the reading of the Shema (Deut. vi. 4, &c.), but not at night, or on the Sabbath or festivals, because it was held that being themselves signs, no others were required. Passing through burying-places, wearing phylacteries and carrying a book of the law was prohibited. They were believed to act like charms, and hence it became a religious duty to recite them at home at night in order to drive away devils. The Almighty is represented in the *Talmud* as wearing them, and swearing 'by His strong arm,' was expounded by the Rabbis to mean swearing by the phylacteries.

Lightfoot has fallen into a strange mistake in confounding the phylactery sentences with the Shema, which all were

bound to recite daily, whether in the synagogue or not. 'The Shema,' or 'Hear,' comprised three passages of Scripture—Deut. vi. 4-9, Deut. xi. 13-21, and Numbers xv. 37-41—and derives its name from the Hebrew of the first word of the first of them—'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' The yoke of the kingdom of heaven, as understood by the Rabbis, meant reciting the Shema, which contains an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God. 'Let a man,' said R. Joshua, 'wash his hands, put on his phylacteries, recite the Shema, and pray; and this is the yoke of the kingdom of heaven complete.' At a certain part of the ritual of the daily sacrifice in the Temple the priests retired to the chamber Gazith to read the Shema. 'The captain of the watch said, "Give one blessing," and the priests blessed and read the Ten Commandments, "Hear," &c. (Deut. vi. 4, 8), "and it shall come to pass" (Deut. xi. 13, &c.), and "He spake" (Numb. xv. 37, &c.). They then gave the three blessings to the people—"Truth and sureness," and "the service," and "the blessing of the priests," and on the Sabbath they added one blessing for the outgoing Temple guard.' In this passage, the order of the sentences stated above is observed, while it also seems to prove that, along with them, the Shema included the Decalogue. The Jerusalem *Talmud* said that it embraced the 'ten words.' "Why do they read those sections every day?" R. Levi said. "Because the ten words are contained in them." The public reading of the Ten Commandments was discontinued after the spread of the Christian religion, that 'heretics' might be deprived of the opportunity of cavilling, or saying, 'Those only were given to Moses on Mount Sinai, and not the rest of the law.' This refers to the Christians, who held that the moral law stood on a different footing from the Mosaic rites and ceremonies.

In addition to the daily recitation of the Shema in the Temple by the priests, it was said also in the synagogues on the days of public worship, and every day in private by devout Jews. The time in the morning when it might be repeated began, when it was possible to distinguish between blue and white, and ended at the third hour, or nine o'clock. It began in the evening from the time that the priests entered the Temple to eat the sin offerings, and continued to the end of the first watch at ten o'clock. In the morning two blessings were said before and one after, and in the evening two before and two after, one being long and the other short. Workmen on the top of a tree, or on a wall repairing a house, were bound to recite it there, at the proper time, but they

were not allowed to repeat the prayer containing the eighteen benedictions. Bridegrooms, mourners, persons employed at funerals, women, slaves, and children, and men who were legally unclean, were exempt from saying the Shema.

It was incumbent on all Jews who were not hindered by any legal impediment to say the eighteen benedictions either in private or in the synagogue. If they could not be all remembered, a summary of them was provided, which might be used instead. R. Akiba said, 'If his prayer be fluent in his mouth, he says the eighteen, but, if not, let him say a summary of them.' The Jew was warned against the error of supposing that prayer regarded merely as a duty to be discharged at set times was supplication, or that mere formalism would be accepted in the place of heartfelt service. R. Eliezer said, 'If one make his prayer fixed (a stated ordinance), his prayer is not supplication.' When the time for it had come, wherever he might be, he was bound to perform the religious exercise. If riding on an ass, he was obliged to dismount, and if he could not do so, he was required to turn his face, and if this was impossible, it was his duty to turn his heart to the Holy of Holies. If sailing in a ship, or riding in a carriage, or seated on a raft, the same obligation was incumbent upon him.

If ten persons of full age were present, irrespective of females, public prayers were recited in the synagogues on the Sabbath, and on the other days of meeting, as well as on festivals. The minister called forth a member of the congregation, who passed up before the Ark, in order to recite the eighteen benedictions. The practice on fast days, when it was taken out and placed in the principal street of the city, as described in the *Talmud*, may be taken as illustrating the usage in the synagogues, and the qualifications required in the person who was called upon to discharge this duty. In the first instance an elder addressed the people standing around, in language suited to the occasion, and 'when they stood in prayer, they placed before the Ark an aged man, and full of experience, one who had children, and an unblemished house, that his heart might not be distracted in prayer, and he said before them twenty-four blessings, the usual eighteen for every day, and he added to them six more.' Each of the six is given in the *Talmud* at length, the last being followed by the concluding benediction: 'He who answered David and Solomon his son in Jerusalem, He will answer you and will hear the voice of your cry this day. Blessed be Thou Lord who hast pity on the earth.' The person

chosen to be the deputy of the congregation, was required to be of good repute, and properly qualified. He was to be wise, not suspected of heresy, or of any leaning towards Paganism or Christianity, and one whose reputation had been unblemished from his earliest years. No one might recite the benedictions or read the law, whose garments were torn, but this did not disqualify him from saying the Shema, or acting as interpreter. The prayers were to be said from memory, and if the deputy made a mistake, another, who was not at liberty to refuse, was summoned from the congregation to take up the benediction in which the other had erred. Such an accident was regarded as a bad sign, both for the man himself, and, if he were the representative of a congregation in the Temple service, for them also.

Among the eighteen blessings recited in the synagogue, one called the 'heretic benediction' was inserted in the time of Rabban Gamaliel, when Christianity had begun to rise into notice. He was president of the Sanhedrim in Jabneh, after it had removed from Jerusalem, and not the tutor of S. Paul. It was prepared at his instance by Samuel the Little, and ultimately it stood twelfth in order. 'Take away all hope from apostates from our faith, and let all heretics, however numerous, suddenly perish, and let the kingdom of pride be overthrown, and quickly crushed in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord God, who dost overthrow the wicked and humble the proud.' This impious prayer was directed both against those of the Jews who became Christians, and against the Romans, who held the nation in subjection.

The recitation of the Shema followed the prayers, and after it came the reading of the Law and the Prophets on every Sabbath day, but on some other occasions the latter were omitted. The Prophets were also read on holy-days, on fasts, and on the ninth of the month Ab, which was kept as a strict fast, because it was believed that on that day the Jews were told that they could not be permitted to enter the promised land. It was also observed as a season of humiliation, because on it the Temple was twice destroyed, and Jerusalem was razed to the ground. On the Sabbath there were seven readers, on the Day of Atonement six, on holy-days five, on the new moons and on the seven days of the three great festivals four, and on the second and fifth days of the week three, no smaller number being allowed. Of the seven, the first called forth by the minister was a priest, the second a Levite, and the remaining five ordinary members of the congregation. Every Jew was liable to be called on, except

women, slaves, the blind, idiots, those whose clothes were torn, and minors, but some Rabbis thought that those who were under age might be allowed to read, if the lessons appointed were not taken from the book of Esther. The reader was required to stand, this attitude being enjoined out of respect for the law itself, and because God had said to Moses, 'Stand thou here with me.' The minister stood beside him to see that no mistake was made, and close at hand was the interpreter, who explained the meaning in the vernacular to the congregation. The latter might enlarge on the passage by way of illustration, as is clear from the amplification so common in the Targums. The same rules were followed as to the lesson from the Prophets. The reader seems to have been permitted to select some other passage than that appointed for the day, if any conclusion can be drawn from the conduct of Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth. When the reading of the Prophets had been completed, and the benedictions, with the additional prayers, had been recited, the congregation retired. On particular occasions, as is evident from the Acts of the Apostles, and from other places in the New Testament, a discourse might be delivered before the people separated.

In the treatise on the Roll, there are instructions as to the way in which certain portions of Scripture were to be dealt with. The history of Reuben was to be read, but not explained, and that of Tamar was to be both read and explained. The first history of the Golden Calf was to be both read and interpreted, but the second was to be read only. The benediction of the High Priest, and the history of David, and Ammon his son, were neither read nor explained. The history of the chariot in Ezekiel was not to be read, nor, according to another authority, the sixteenth chapter. The book of Esther was appointed to be read on the feast of Purim, which fell on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the month Adar, and special lessons from the Law on the feasts of weeks, on the first day of the new year, at the new moon, and on other occasions. It was the privilege of the person appointed to read the lesson from the Prophets, to recite the concluding benediction before the Ark, and to be one of those who raised their hands to bless the congregation, but if a minor, his father or his guardian was to act in his place.

During public worship, when the deputy of the congregation came to the seventeenth benediction, all the priests who were present ascended the pulpit, and stood with their faces toward the Ark, and their hands closed. As soon as it was

finished, they turned to the congregation, and raising their hands outstretched in a mystical way, they repeated after him, word for word, the priestly blessing, all the people, except the deputy, saying Amen at the end of each clause. If the hands of a priest were deformed, or stained with yellow or vermilion, he was not permitted to lift them up. The manner of performing this function is described in the *Talmud*: 'At the daily sacrifice they blessed the people once. In the city (in the synagogues) they said the service in three blessings, but in the sanctuary they said it in one blessing. In the sanctuary they pronounced the name (Jehovah), as it is written, but in the city they pronounced it by its substitute (Adonai). In the city, the priests raised their hands in blessing opposite their shoulders, but in the sanctuary they raised them above their heads, excepting the High Priest, who could not lift his hands above the golden plate.' In the synagogues priests were not allowed to pronounce the blessing at the afternoon service, lest, after having dined, they might not be in a fit state to discharge this solemn function. If no priest were present, the deputy, when he came to the eighteenth benediction, having first prayed that God would bless the congregation, as it was written in the Law, repeated the form, but not in the authoritative manner of the priests, the superiority of the sacerdotal order in discharging this function being strictly observed. If the deputy were a priest, and no other minister of his order were present, it was deemed to be inexpedient that he should perform both duties, except in exceptional cases.

The synagogue was the place where beating was inflicted as the punishment of offenders who had been condemned by the court which held its sittings there. Whether the Sanhedrim of three, which had the power of inflicting stripes, was a section of the governing body, as maintained by Lightfoot, is a matter of doubt. He thinks that they were a permanent court, always present on the days appointed for public worship, for the trial of cases of lesser importance. It is, on the other hand, the opinion of Vitringa, that they were members of the secondary Sanhedrims, who met in the synagogues after morning service, for the correction of any persons who might be brought before them. If found guilty punishment was at once inflicted before the court, as is clear from Acts v. 40. From the prediction that 'wise men and scribes' should be beaten in the synagogues, and from S. Paul's statement, 'of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one,' the only possible inference is, that the first teachers of Christianity,

atter being allowed to address the congregation, were immediately tried for broaching a distasteful subject, and then flogged in its presence, though the New Testament has no notice of such a punishment having been inflicted.

Although all Jews united in external observances, they were divided into sects differing on many important questions. Josephus speaks of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes as existing in his day, but of the last the *Talmud* makes no mention. But it mentions the Scribes, who are so often spoken of in the New Testament. There is a modern opinion that the Sadducees existed as a sect from a much more remote period than is generally supposed. Geiger held that they were a sacerdotal conservative party, which derived its name from Zadok, who anointed King Solomon. At a later period, Ezekiel (ch. xlv. 10-15) speaks of two classes of Levites, of which one was not to be permitted to minister in the sanctuary as a punishment for its apostasy. The other, the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok, having continued faithful when the people went astray, were to be retained in the exercise of their functions in the Temple. In the synoptical Gospels, the Sadducees appear in alliance with the Pharisees, notwithstanding the bitter enmity between them, but in the fourth they are not mentioned, the combination being 'chief priests and Pharisees' (John vii. 32, 45; xi. 47, 57). In the Acts (ch. v. 17) we read, 'the High Priest arose, and all that were with him, being of the sect of the Sadducees.' From these passages it is plain that Zadok was a priest in the age of Solomon, that his descendants were priests at the time of the captivity and afterwards, and that they were a sacerdotal party at the Christian era, but there is difficulty in identifying them with the Sadducees, since no place in the literature of the Jews subsequent to the exile, speaks of them as belonging to the sect, or as having given their name to it. Had the designation been in common use from early times, it is scarcely credible that there should not have been some traces of it in Jewish records.

That the germs of Sadduceeism existed long before the time of Antigonus of Soco, has been inferred from Mal. iii. 14, in connexion with Ezekiel xxxvii. It has been supposed that in the times of the Prophets there were some who denied a resurrection. Reading Ezekiel's description of the valley of dry bones, Jews of sceptical tendencies may have given to it a literal interpretation, and when the prophecy, so understood, never came to pass, they may have arrived at the conclusion that the dead would never come again to life. If so, there

was a sort of preparation for the more pronounced opinions which the sect afterwards advanced. Simon the Just, one of the last of the men of the Great Synagogue, was succeeded by Antigonus, who seems, from his name, to have been a Greek proselyte. The saying attributed to him in the treatise on the Fathers was, 'Be not as servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving a reward, but be like servants who serve their master without the view of receiving a reward, and let the fear of heaven be upon you;' a maxim simply inculcating disinterestedness, and with no allusion whatever to the existence of a future state, or the contrary. Several generations of his disciples had passed away, before the true meaning of his words was misapprehended. At length the question was asked, What did the Fathers mean, when they said that a labourer might work all the day and not receive his reward in the evening? If they had believed in the world to come, and in a resurrection of the dead, they would not have so spoken. The denial of both was soon formulated by the heresiarchs, Sadok and Baithos, whose followers were called respectively Sadducees and Baithuseans. Their opinions being at variance with fundamental tenets of the Jewish religion, they were compelled to remove to the Samaritan temple at Gerizim. The sect afterwards flourished in Egypt, where they were called Karaites, because they rejected tradition, and acknowledged Scripture only. Of the writings of the Sadducees none have survived, but it has been conjectured that the apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus contains their theological and sacerdotal principles. In the *Ghemara*, in the treatise on the Sanhedrim, the books of the Sadducees and the work of the son of Sirach are classified together, and prohibited.

Whether they received all the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament has long been a question. In the controversy in the New Testament about the resurrection, Christ quoted against them a passage from the Pentateuch, from whence it has been inferred that they rejected the rest of the Bible. The truth seems to have been that they acknowledged the five books of Moses as of higher authority than the others, in common with most of the Jews, while not denying the canonicity of the latter, although in their opinion they occupied an inferior place. The Pharisees pronounced them heretics, and doubted whether they would not be excluded from the blessings of the world to come. Their influence was limited to the wealthy and upper classes, and over the bulk of the nation their opinions never had any hold. When Jerusalem was

destroyed, their power as a sacerdotal oligarchy came to an end, and thenceforward the name was descriptive of a person who failed to come up to the Pharisaic standard of orthodoxy.

The controversies stirred up by their negative opinions are frequently referred to in the *Talmud*. In the treatise on Blessings, it is said, that at the conclusion of all the blessings in the sanctuary, it was usual to say 'from eternity,' but when the Epicureans arose, which must be taken in this passage as another name for the Sadducees, affirming that there was no world but the present, that the usage was changed, and men were directed to say, 'from eternity to eternity.' Upon this the gloss is, 'In the first temple they said, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for ever;" but when the heretics broke in and said, there is no age but this, Ezra and his consistory appointed that it should be said, "for ever and ever," or "from age to age," to imply that there is a double world, to root out the opinion of those who denied the resurrection of the dead.' Eliezer's maxim was, 'Be diligent to study the law, that thou mayest know how to confute the Epicurean,' where the term means a Sadducee or Jewish heretic, whose opinions were to be confuted from that portion of Scripture to which he attached most importance. One argument used to prove a resurrection was deserving of notice. That which was not, came into being, and shall not that much more which has been already? meaning, that God who had created the body, which had no previous existence, could raise up what had already lived. Out of these controversies arose terms which still continue in use. The world to come, paradise, Abraham's bosom, and other expressions, which either imply or assert a resurrection, began to be employed, and have ever since served to formulate great truths.

The Sadducees, while rejecting tradition, adopted usages which the Pharisees said were founded upon it. Like them they wore phylacteries, but in a fashion which their opponents pronounced to be evidence of their heretical opinions. Even in the Temple service, some of the priests ministered 'after the way of the Sadducees,' and in a manner inconsistent with the usual practice. The treatise on the Day of Atonement relates the precautions of the Pharisees to prevent the High Priest from falling into Sadducean error. 'The elders of the Great Sanhedrim delivered him to the elders of the Priesthood, who brought him to the upper chamber of the house Abtinah, and they administered to him the oath, and they left him and departed, and they said to him, "My Lord High Priest, we are ambassadors of the Great Sanhedrim: we adjure

thee by Him whose name dwells in this house, that thou wilt not change aught of all which we have said to thee." He went apart and wept. They went apart and wept.' The oath was intended to bind him to burn the incense within the veil (Lev. xvi. 12, 13), in opposition to the view of the Sadducees, that it should be put upon the coals in the censer without, and carried smoking into the Most Holy place. The weeping of the elders arose from the thought that such an oath should be necessary. At the end of the treatise on the Feast Offering, it is said that all the vessels in the sanctuary required baptism, except the golden and brazen altars, which were 'as earth.' This was a tradition of the Pharisees, who, when they were baptizing the candlestick, brought upon themselves the ridicule of their opponents, who mocked them as if they were baptizing the sun. The Sadducees agreed with their adversaries only as to ceremonies, their practice resting upon the letter of the law, explained so as to meet their own views, but often doing violence to the plain meaning of the text. In these cases the Pharisees relied upon tradition, without pretending to derive any authority from Scripture.

Of the Jewish sects the Pharisees were the most powerful and important. Principles had been long at work in the nation which ultimately assumed form and shape in their distinguishing peculiarities. In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah every possible precaution was taken to dissociate the Jews from the Samaritans, Moabites, and other nations, to prevent contamination from their evil customs. From the same motive, some Israelites, pretending to superior holiness, endeavoured, as far as possible, to separate themselves from others, as if they were profane, and unfit for indiscriminate fellowship. Hence arose, in the course of time, the Pharisees or Separatists, who, in respect to certain observances, stood aloof from their fellow-men. They did not withdraw from association with others at public worship in the synagogues, nor did they hold aloof from the Sanhedrims, where they occupied seats along with the Sadducees, nor did they shun ordinary society, because they frequented the houses of their neighbours, and were desirous of making proselytes. Their exclusiveness consisted in other particulars.

Aiming at greater sanctity, they sought to influence their countrymen by adopting a rule of conduct higher than that laid down in the law. The *Mishna* is mainly a collection of Pharisaic traditions, regulating almost every act of civil and ecclesiastical life, whereby the burden of minute precepts became so heavy, that compliance with them was impossible.

The written and the oral law were held to have been both of divine origin, but, in the course of time, the latter came to have the greater weight attached to it. 'Moses received the oral law from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua delivered it to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue.' 'We have two laws' said Shammai to a proselyte: 'the written and the oral.' That which was given by word of mouth was held to be the more precious, because it was said, 'After the tenor of these words, I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel' (Ex. xxxiv. 27). 'The written law is narrow, but the traditional is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea.' The traditions were of two classes. The former, including the unwritten law, was supposed to have been given to Moses at Sinai, and to have been transmitted by him to succeeding generations. The latter were the glosses, commentaries, and expositions of it which had accumulated from time to time, but these were deemed by some to be of inferior importance. In other words, the *Mishna*, with the *Ghemara*, is the embodiment of the oral law. Other Rabbis said that the *Bible* was like water, the *Mishna* like wine, and the *Ghemara* like spiced wine.

Tradition being thus elevated, the Pharisees easily found authority for drawing a broad line of distinction between themselves and others. They supposed that such separation tended to preserve the body from evil works, that the holiness of the body contributed to ward off evil affections from the soul, and that the sanctity of the soul produced likeness to God. Adopting a more austere discipline, to keep up the appearance of righteousness, they adopted corresponding observances. Frequent fastings, long prayers, ablutions, wearing of extravagant phylacteries and fringes, and scrupulous punctiliousness about the payment of tithes, while outward proofs of religiousness, failed to prevent the hypocrisy of the sect from being discerned and commented upon, or to hinder it from being subdivided into separate parties. The *Talmud* speaks of seven classes of Pharisees. There were those who served God from selfishness, those who said, Just wait awhile for me, I have one more good work to perform, those who knocked their heads against walls to avoid the sight of women, those who wrapped their hands in their garments to avoid touching others lest they might be defiled, those who asked to behold some duty which they might perform, meaning that they had neglected none, and those who were Pharisees because they professed religion from

motives of terror. The last class, and the only one deserving of approbation, were those who served God from love. All alike hated and denounced the Sadducees. Notwithstanding their vices and hypocrisy, their influence with the people was great. Unlike their rivals, they could count upon the support of public opinion. Although despising other men, and refusing to eat with them, which was the very essence of Pharisaism, they managed their conduct in such a way as not to forfeit their respect, or raise up enemies. 'Treading on the garments of an ordinary man defiled the Pharisees,' but the exclusiveness which this implied did not alienate the good will of the multitude. They recited their prayers with the same end in view, and a considerable portion of every day was devoted to religious exercises. 'The pious of ancient days used to pause an hour before they began to pray, that they might direct their hearts to God,' and one hour after, so that if one were spent in prayer three times a day, they ostensibly consumed nine in devotion and meditation. The Pharisees said that long prayers made a long life.

The schools of Shammai and Hillel were both composed of Pharisees, but the former was the straiter. Their controversies mostly turned on trifling and absurd questions, which occupy a considerable portion of the *Talmud*. Shammai was self-asserting, and mostly began the controversy, but he was not as ready as Hillel to give every man a patient hearing. Presumption and impatience became the distinguishing characteristics of his followers. By a sort of legal fiction the decisions of both schools were supposed to be of equal authority. For three years a dispute had been carried on as to whether it were better for a man to have been created or not, the school of Shammai affirming the former position, and that of Hillel, the latter. At length it was decided that it would have been better for him if he had not been born, but that having come into the world, he should look well to his doings. The treatise on Blessings discusses conduct at meals, whether the blessing of the day, or the wine, should be first pronounced, whether water should be first poured on the hands, and the goblet be then mixed, or *vice versa*, whether a guest should wipe his hands on the napkin, and then lay it on the table or on the cushion, whether the order of one blessing should be, 'the light, the food, the spices, and the distinction of the day,' or 'the light, the spices, the food, and the distinction of the day,' and whether the form of another should be, 'who created the light of fire,' or 'creator of the lights of fire.' The treatise on the Sabbath narrates

a controversy as to what constituted work, which also illustrates the puerility of the Pharisaic and Rabbinic mind; and yet, for all their puerility, these disputes were looked upon with awe by ordinary persons, because they were believed to be carried on with a view to the glory of God. 'Every dispute that is carried on for God's sake will in the end be established. What may be considered a dispute for God's sake? Such as the disputes of Hillel and Shammai.'

The Pharisees separated themselves from everything unclean, or likely to produce defilement. They not only held aloof from other men, and refused to eat or drink with them, but they also took strict precautions against taking unclean food, and against sitting down to meals when in a state of impurity. This was the great mystery of the sect, and when carried out properly, was one of the most important means of obtaining the favour of heaven. 'Whosoever has his seat in the land of Israel, and eateth his common food in cleanness, and speaks the holy language, and recites his phylacteries morning and evening, let him be confident that he shall obtain the life of the world to come.' Between meats prohibited and unclean, a distinction was drawn. The former, such as fat, blood, and animals forbidden in the law, might not be eaten at all, but the latter, although they might be lawfully eaten, were rendered unclean by some particular cause. They were lawful to be eaten because they were permitted by the law of God, but they were unlawful, because forbidden by the precepts of the Pharisees. Clean food was rendered unclean by defiled hands, and the hands were defiled by unclean meats. Thus it became a matter of special obligation with the Pharisees to see that, as far as possible, the meat to be eaten was free from impurity, and as they could not be always certain of this, to take precautions that it should not be rendered unclean by their hands. Hence arose the washing of them, both when they knew and when they did not know that they were unclean. The ceremonial washing of hands was attributed to a tradition of the Scribes, and was considered of so much importance, that an audacious Rabbi who made light of it, was excommunicated by the Sanhedrim in the interests of the Pharisees, and after his death, a great stone was laid upon his body. The whole subject of this mystery is discussed in detail in the Talmudic treatise 'On Hands,' the reading of which Lightfoot with some truth pronounced to be both 'toil-some and nauseous,' and in that entitled, 'The Feast Offering,' both containing precepts and distinctions wholly impossible to be observed in the practice of ordinary life.

The Scribes were originally a literary class, whose business was to transcribe the sacred text according to rules which are preserved in the *Ghemara*. They are called in the treatise on the Fathers, 'Men of the Great Synagogue,' who flourished from the return from the captivity, till the Græco-Syrian persecutions, about B.C. 220, but were afterwards known as 'the Scribes.' Their maxim was, 'Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence for the law.' This they did by laying down rules intended to promote its better observance, not, however, always consistent with each other. They counted the words and letters of the Hebrew text to preserve it from interpolation. They wrote out the phylactery sentences, the *mesusa* or passages of Scripture attached to door-posts, bills of contract and divorce, and other documents, and by degrees they came to be recognised as legal practitioners. Hence in the New Testament they are called lawyers and doctors of the law. Lightfoot, but apparently without sufficient authority, says that the Scribes, as such, were those who occupied themselves mainly with the *Mikra* or written law. The lawyers were students of the *Mishna*, who acted as assessors to the Sanhedrim, but without the right of voting. The doctors of the law were expounders of the *Ghemara*, and occasionally members of the judicial body. As public teachers, the Scribes explained Scripture according to the traditions, of which they professed themselves to be the guardians, teaching the youth in the schools, and preaching in the synagogues. They occupied seats in the Sanhedrims, and in their judicial capacity they applied the oral law to the cases which came before them.

Their authority was great, and to their opinions much weight was attached. It was their interest to maintain the authority of tradition, because their existence as a distinct class depended largely upon it. Yet, as expounded by them, tradition came to be viewed as superior even to Scripture itself. 'The words of the Scribes are akin to the words of the law, and more beloved than the words of the law, for (Cant. i. 2) "thy love is better than mine," that is, of the law.' 'The words of the Scribes are lovely, above the words of the law, for the words of the law are weighty and light, but the words of the Scribes are all weighty.' 'The burden in the words of the Scribes is greater than the burden in the words of the law. He who said, There are no phylacteries, so as to transgress the words of the law, he is free; he who said, There are five frontlets, so as to add to the words of the Scribes, he is guilty.' Precautions were also taken by them

to secure their individual importance. If two men were eating together, each, if both were Scribes, was bound to return thanks for himself, but if one were an ignorant person, the thanksgiving of the other was to be deemed sufficient for both. The Scribes taught also, that a wise man was to be respected above men of every other class, and even more than a king. Not content with theory, they sought by an outward show of religion to attract to themselves public applause, joining with the Pharisees in long and ostentatious prayers. While both devoured widows' houses for their own aggrandisement, they brought alike upon themselves the denunciations of Jesus for their hypocrisy and avarice (Matt. xxiii.) They sought to make proselytes, with a further view to their personal advantage, and not from disinterested motives, but with the Jews, proselytes were held in little esteem, and not even the influence of the Scribes could remove the prejudice against them. The Rabbis taught that they hindered the coming of the Messiah, and that they were as a scab in Israel; because they were ignorant of the law, because they were supposed to be revengeful, and because they tempted the Jews to imitate their customs.

Many questions which have occupied the attention of thinking minds in all ages are discussed in the *Talmud*, and strange opinions concerning them are frequently given. It was a notion of the Rabbis that before the world was actually created, there existed in the Divine mind seven conceptions on archetypal ideas, which afterwards became outward realities. The law, Gehenna, the garden of Eden, the throne of glory, the sanctuary, repentance, and the name of the Messiah, were pre-existent before creation. It was the first which counselled God to make the world, and which also became in His hands the instrument by which the work was carried into effect, as well as the plan according to which it was developed, this being the Talmudic method of setting forward the idea of design in the works of nature. One proof of the high privilege of Israel was, that afterwards was entrusted to its keeping the instrument so employed by God. The doctrine of progressive creations, ending in the present order of things, is laid down in the Rabbinic writings. 'And God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good. Rabbi Tanchuma said, "The world was created in its season." The world was not fitted to be created before that. Said Rabbi Abuhu: "Hence it appears that the Holy One, blessed is He, was creating worlds and destroying them, till He created these. He said, These are satisfactory to Me, these are not satisfactory to Me."'

The schools of Shammai and Hillel disputed whether the heavens or the earth were created first. The former maintained that the heavens were the prior creation, because it is said, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' The latter affirmed the opposite view, because it is said, 'In the day that the Lord made the earth and the heavens.' The sages held that both were created at the same time, for it is said, 'Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens; when I call upon them they stand up together' (Isa. xlviii. 13). This was taken to mean that the left hand of God created the earth, and that the right hand at the same time created the heavens. The view of the school of Hillel seems to correspond with the statement of S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 46), 'that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.' Matter was regarded as essentially evil, and its creation, according to Rabbinic symbolism, was fitly attributed to the left hand of God. The world was created by ten sayings. The grandeur of creation was supposed to be more vividly described by being represented as the result of repeated acts of power, than of a single fiat of Omnipotence. God laboured so much in creating the world by ten expressions, that He might enhance the guilt of sinners who mar it by their sins, and the merit of the righteous who preserve it. The Rabbis reckoned that the expression 'God said' is used nine times in the first chapter of Genesis, and the tenth was supposed to be implied in the words employed in the first verse, because it was affirmed elsewhere, that 'by the word of the Lord were the heavens created, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.' Other ways of representing the process of creation are found in the Rabbinic writings. In one place it is the law, in another it is the ideal Israel, and in another it is the merit of Moses which is represented as the creative agent. Every time that God spake an angel was created. In the beginning the true light was brought into existence, but it was afterwards taken from the generations which were unworthy of it, because 'from the wicked their light is withdrawn' (Job xxxviii. 15), and was reserved for the righteous in the future, when 'the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold as the light of the seven days' (Isa. xxx. 26) of creation were. By means of it the first Adam saw from one end of the world to the other. The terrestrial man was created as the correlative of an archetypal and celestial being in heaven, and was made literally in the image

of God. There is also an upper family, to which the lower corresponds, and whatever be the condition or action of the one, must have its counterpart in the other. The first Adam was co-extensive with the world, being made from dust gathered from all parts of the earth. He was created with two faces, because it is said, 'Thou hast fashioned me behind and before.' He extended from the earth to the firmament, because it is said that he was created upon or above the earth, but he was afterwards compressed by the hand of God, for it is again said, 'Thou didst form me, and didst lay Thine hand upon me.' In the tenth hour after he was created he sinned, and in the twelfth he was driven out of Paradise.

On the evening of the sixth day in the twilight, ten remarkable things were created, the mouth of the earth, the mouth of the well, the mouth of the ass, the rainbow, the manna, the rod of Moses, the *shameer*, that is, the worm which helped Solomon to build the Temple, the letters, writing, and the tables of stone. To these some Rabbis added the demons, the grave of Moses, the ram of Abraham, and the tongs, with the model of them. Miracles were preordained, and being primevally existent, at whatever time they were wrought, nature was not disturbed by them. Equally wonderful was the art of writing, the invention of which was thought to be nothing short of miraculous. The demons are invisible to the human eye, because God had created their souls, and was about to create their bodies, when the Sabbath set in, and He was prevented. If they could be seen, no creature could exist because of them, for every man has a thousand at his left hand, and ten thousand at his right. They assisted Solomon in finding the *shameer*, and co-operated with him in building the Temple. 'The model of tongs' was a Rabbinic effort to arrive at the last of a chain of secondary causes. Speculation, failing to reach the ultimate, must rest upon the doctrine that God is the Creator. In the Ghemara on the Feast Offering, it is said, 'On what stands the earth? On the pillars (Job ix. 6), and the pillars on the waters (Ps. cxxxvi. 6), and the waters upon the mountains (Ps. civ. 6), and the mountains upon the wind (Amos iv. 13), and the wind upon the storm (Ps. cxlviii. 8), and the storm depends on the arm of the Holy One, for it is said (Deut. xxxiii. 27) "underneath are the everlasting arms."'

The soul was held to be pre-existent. All souls which were to be united to bodies were created once for all, and hidden away from the moment of their creation, till they were required to animate human creatures. Being of Divine origin,

they know all things, but at the moment of birth an angel touches the mouth of the child and all is forgotten. The whole human race was created in Adam as in an embryo, or *golem*, because it is said, 'Thine eyes did see my substance (*golem*), and in Thy book were all my members written' (Ps. cxxxix. 16). But he fell short of the Creator's idea, which will be fully realised in the future, when the Son of Man shall bridge the chasm between heaven and earth (John i. 32). This is a remarkable anticipation of Archbishop King's account of the origin of evil, which was afterwards elaborated by Butler in the *Analogy*. When Adam was disobedient, the pre-existent souls shared in his fall and in its consequences.

Predestination and free will are both taught in the *Talmud*. 'Everything is in the hands of heaven, except the fear of heaven.' 'All things are ordained of God, but men's actions are their own.' 'Everything is foreseen by God, but freedom of choice is given unto man. The world is judged in goodness, though all is according to the greatness of the work.' The goodness of God (Rom. xi. 22) and his judgment of men according to their works are contrasted with each other, in a way similar to the parallel drawn by S. Paul. The final judgment depends upon the preponderance of good over evil deeds or the contrary, in each man's life.

Traces of mysticism derived from the Magian superstition are also to be found. All things in Scripture were not to be made known indiscriminately, because all were not equally fitted to understand theosophic speculations, which should only be communicated with caution. This is an anticipation of the modern doctrine of reserve. 'Honey and milk are under the tongue. Things which are sweeter than honey should be under the tongue,' that is, they should not be revealed. The discussion of the history of creation, and of the description of the chariot, in the first chapter of Ezekiel, was considered to be improper, and men were warned against it. 'Men may not discourse on illegal connexions with three, nor on the work of creation with two, nor on the cherubs (Ez. x., Is. vi.) with one, save when one is wise, and comprehends it of his own knowledge. Every one who considers four things, it were suitable for him that he did not come into the world, what is in the height, what is in the depth, what is before, and what is behind.'

The duty of showing kindness to others is enforced in the *Talmud*, having regard, in the first instance, to Jews, and afterwards to mankind at large. It was the saying of Simon the Just, that the world stood on three things, 'on the law,

on the worship, and on the bestowal of kindness.' The maxim of Hillel was, 'Be thou of the disciples of Aaron, who loved peace, and pursued peace, so that thou love mankind, and allure them to the study of the law.' On the other hand, he that hated his fellow-men would be punished. R. Joshua said, 'An evil eye, and the evil nature, and hatred of the creatures (Rom. viii. 19) put a man out of the world,' that is, deprive him of his portion in the world to come. 'Whoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him' (1 John iii. 15).

Hatred of the heathen, as inferior beings, was deeply rooted in the Jewish mind. Oaths sworn to a Gentile were not binding, and no service might be rendered to him, except on receiving a recompence. Social kindnesses were forbidden, and there was no obligation upon a Jew of restoring anything a Gentile had lost. To the question, Why are the Gentiles defiled? the answer given was, 'Because they did not stand on Mount Sinai, for in the hour the serpent came to Eve he communicated defilement, which was removed from Israel when they stood on Mount Sinai.' This harsh feeling was somewhat mitigated, because it was said, in the treatise on the Sabbatical year, 'Men may contract for cultivated fields from Gentiles in the Sabbatical year, but not from Israelites, and they may strengthen the hands of the Gentiles in the Sabbatical year, but not the hands of Israelites, and in saluting Gentiles, they may ask after their peace for the sake of peace' (Jer. xxix. 7). The more enlightened Rabbis thought that virtuous Gentiles were not beyond the hope of salvation. R. Johanan received the oral law from Hillel and Shammai, and was an eminent teacher in his day. He inferred from the statement that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' that moral goodness might atone for them, as the sin offering made atonement for Israel. 'Bringing mankind nigh to the law' was illustrated by making one proselyte every year to typify the salvability of the Gentiles. It was also said that the final cause of the captivities of the Jews was that they might make proselytes, and that in the days of the Messiah, all the Gentiles shall accept the true faith. But they were only bound to attract men to the law by the force of their good example, and not to proselytise in the ordinary sense.

Repentance held an important place in the Rabbinic system. Eliezer said that repentance and good deeds were a shield against the Divine punishment; and another Rabbi that 'The perfection of wisdom is repentance.' The Jewish

notion that it existed before the world as a conception in the mind of the Creator shows the great importance attached to it. Rabbi Jacob said, that 'one hour employed in repentance and good deeds in this world, was better than the whole life in the world to come, and that one hour's refreshment of spirit in it, was better than the whole life in this world;' meaning that repentance and amendment were an equivalent for the future life, and the means by which it was secured. On the other hand, one hour of the enjoyment of the world to come would outweigh all the joys of this life, according to the Psalmist's words, 'A day in Thy courts is better than a thousand.' Profaning the name of God was another unpardonable sin, for which repentance was not appointed. For it the day of atonement made no expiation, and personal sufferings were of no avail, but, taken together, they provided a respite till death purged the offence. At the end of the treatise which contains the ritual of the great annual sacrifice, there is a statement in respect to the efficacy of repentance. 'Death and the day of atonement with repentance make atonement. Repentance atones for light transgressions, for commands positive and negative, but grave offences are suspended till the day of atonement come, and it will atone. To him who said, I will sin and repent, the opportunity of repentance was not given, and for him who said, I will sin and the day of atonement shall atone, the day of atonement made no atonement.' In other words, for the person who sinned presumptuously, neither repentance nor atonement were appointed.

Retributive justice is taught with marked emphasis, in cases of offences not coming under the cognisance of the Sanhedrim, or for which no human punishment was appointed. Seven serious sins entailed seven different forms of divine visitation. When a portion of the people withheld the tithes, scarcity and dearth ensued, so that some had abundance, while others were starving, but when the whole nation fell into this sin, confusion and general famine were the consequence. When the heave-offering of the cake of dough was not offered (Num. xv. 20) confusion and fire ensued. Pestilence went abroad on account of sins, for which the law assigned death as the penalty, but which were not recognised by the judges, and for failure to observe the instructions regarding the fruits of the Sabbatical year. When justice was delayed or perverted, and when the law was explained contrary to its true sense, war followed as the penalty. The scourge of wild beasts followed false swearing and profanation of the name

of God. Captivity followed idolatry, immorality, bloodshed, and for cultivating the land in the Sabbatical year. Pestilence prevailed at the end of the Feast of Tabernacles in every year, because the poor were robbed of the gifts due to them (Lev. xix. 9, and Deut. xxiv. 19), in the fourth year, when they were deprived of their share of the tithes of the previous one (Deut. xiv. 28, 29), in the seventh year for the same reason, and at the end of it, when they had been robbed of the fruits of the Sabbatical year (Ex. xxiii. 10, 11). The seven retributive punishments are, therefore, two degrees of famine, confusion and fire, pestilence, war, wild beasts, and exile.

On the other hand, the righteous as well as the wicked receive their reward in this life. The man who had a benevolent eye, a humble spirit, and a contented mind, was a disciple of Abraham, who received the fruit of his good works in this world, and inherited the future, because it was said, 'that I may cause those that love me to inherit substance, and I will fill their treasures' (Prov. viii. 21). Substance by *Gematria*¹ meant three hundred and ten æons. He that had an evil eye, a haughty spirit, and a narrow mind, was a disciple of Balaam, and would inherit Gehinnom, because it was said, 'But Thou, O Lord, shalt bring them into the pit of destruction; bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days, but I will trust in Thee' (Ps. lv. 23).

Notwithstanding the scepticism of the Sadducees, the Jewish mind had a firm hold on the doctrine of a resurrection and a future judgment. It was the saying of R. Hakapher, that 'those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged.' The grave was not a place of refuge, for as man was born and lived without his own consent, so in like manner he would hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of God. Prov. vi. 22, was explained by R. Simeon in the following way:—'When thou goest, it (the law) shall lead thee, that is, in this world. When thou sleepest, it shall keep thee, in the grave, and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee in the world to come.' He understood the passage as proving that when a man departs from this life, the law and good works alone accompany him (Rev. xiv. 13). The soul, at the resurrection, will re-enter the body, and both will be judged as one personality, because it was said, 'He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people' (Ps. l. 4). He shall

¹ *Gematria* is the numerical method of exegesis, the value of the Hebrew letters of a word being taken into account, with the view of ascertaining its secondary meaning.

call to the heavens, that is, the soul, and to the earth, that is, the body, with the view of their being re-united, was the Rabbinic explanation of the passage.

The world to come was compared to a banquet for which everything was prepared (Is. xxv. 6). The same idea appears in the New Testament, where it is said, 'Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb' (Rev. xix. 8). It was a saying of a Rabbi, that there would be there neither eating nor drinking, nor barter, nor envy, nor strife, but that the righteous would sit with crowns on their heads, and enjoy the splendour of the Shecinah, because it was said, 'And they saw God, and did eat and drink' (Ex. xxiv. 11). This figurative interpretation of the banquet of the nobles of the children of Israel, that the vision of God was meat and drink to them, is remarkable as showing that the Jewish mind was not incapable of understanding 'eating' in the higher sense intended by our Lord in S. John vi. 53, &c. On the other hand, God was represented as saying to Israel, 'In this world ye offer me the shewbread and oblations. In the world to come, I will spread for you a great table, and the nations of the world shall behold and be confounded,' for it is said, 'Thou wilt prepare a table before me in the presence of mine enemies' (Ps. xxiii. 5). 'Behold my servants shall eat and ye shall be hungry, behold my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty' (Is. lxv. 13).

ART. VII.—THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

1. *Collected Works of J. N. DARBY. Ecclesiastical.*
2. *The Righteousness of God.* JOHN NELSON DARBY. Law. J. N. D. (London.)
3. *The Assembly of God. Sanctification; and other Papers.* C. H. M. (London.)
4. *Justification in the Risen Christ.* C. STANLEY. (London.)
5. *Justification of Life.* Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London: 1877.)
6. *The Plymouth Brethren.* *British Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1873. (London.)

THERE are few subjects affecting the religious life and welfare of Englishmen, which will better repay our study at the present time, than the principles and the working of the

remarkable society, whose name stands at the head of this paper. We regard its widespread influence as one of the most striking phenomena of the day. Springing into existence suddenly some fifty years ago, under circumstances which seemed to give no promise of prolonged vitality, it has spread itself on every side. It has received large accessions of converts both from among ourselves and the chief nonconformist bodies. It has extended into our colonies; it has followed the footsteps of our missionaries; it has deluged the country with pamphlets and periodicals; its leaflets are to be found in restaurants, in waiting-rooms, and railway-carriages, and in this way numbers, who have no thought of joining the Society, are becoming infected with its principles. The vigorous denunciations it has received from different sections of the Nonconformist press are proofs at once of the powerful influence it has exercised, and of the hostility of that influence to the convictions of the leading bodies of Dissenters; and if it has received less notice from members of our own communion, this is not because its teaching and practical working are more favourable to ourselves. Possibly the entire repudiation of an ordained ministry, and some other peculiarities which characterise the Society, are felt to be so contrary to the instincts of Christendom in general, as to be a fatal bar to its onward progress, and so Churchmen have for the most part been inclined to let it fall by the weight of its own theories, instead of engaging in controversy with its members. Or it may be that the secrecy of their working, the apparent simplicity of their programme, and their professed superiority to all party and sectarian considerations, have blinded us to the extent of their influence and the real character of their distinctive doctrines. But neither these nor any other reasons justify us in passing the subject over. A society, which has spread so far and influenced so many, is of itself a great feature of the times, and none, who wish to understand the period in which they live, can afford to neglect it. We propose therefore to place before our readers a brief account of the history and teaching of the Plymouth Brethren, in the hope that it may lead others, who have opportunity, to give the whole subject a thorough and searching investigation.

Now, it is worthy of our notice, that the very same decade which saw the Plymouth Brethren first assume the form of an independent society, also witnessed two other remarkable events which have influenced, though in very different degrees, the religious life of our time, viz. the rise of the Tractarian School in Oxford, and the formation of the Irvingite

Society in London. This of course may seem to some a mere coincidence, but closer inspection shows it to be far otherwise, for widely as these movements differed in their principles, in their methods, and in their results, there was at least one most important point on which there was a close resemblance between them. All were the result of a great reaction against the divided state of English Christendom, all sought to find some solid ground, on which the followers of Christ might meet, and enjoy something of the visible unity which characterised them in early days.

That the circumstances of the time called for such efforts is clear. The great religious revival of the previous century, though it had quickened individual piety, and lighted up the flame of evangelistic zeal, had been accompanied by a vast amount of division. The chief Dissenting societies had received large accessions to their numbers, a new and formidable schism had been founded and organised, while those who remained faithful to the Church fell, in too many cases, under the influence of that inveterate Erastianism, which characterised in greater or less degree the whole Georgian era. When the true principles of Church unity had been thus lost sight of, a reaction was sooner or later to be expected, though that reaction assumed very different forms in the case of the three movements we are speaking of. The Oxford School sought for a basis of unity by the restoration of primitive doctrine and discipline. The Irvingites, despairing of existing agencies, proclaimed a second Pentecost and a restored Apostolate. The method adopted by the Brethren it will be one object of these pages to elucidate.

But in ascribing to them this as the object at which they aimed, we are referring to a time when they had already taken a position of their own; for their origin we must go back into the previous decade.

The birthplace of this Society was the University of Dublin, and its founder was a Mr. Anthony Norris Groves. Mr. Groves had lived for many years in Plymouth, where he appears to have been on intimate terms with the chief literary and scientific men residing there. But in 1818, he had settled at Exeter, where he practised as a dentist. At this period he was a member of the Church of England, an earnest student of Holy Scripture, and a zealous helper in all good works. During his residence at Exeter he formed the resolution of becoming a missionary: and accordingly, in 1828, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, with a view of preparing for Holy Orders. Here he fell in with some other students of

principles like his own, with whom he used to hold frequent meetings for prayer and the study of Scripture. In the course of his academical career, Mr. Groves arrived at several conclusions adverse to the teaching of the Church to which he belonged. He embraced the views of the Society of Friends on the unlawfulness of war, he rejected the Catholic practice of infant baptism,¹ and at last he became convinced, on what grounds we do not know, that ordination was quite unnecessary for the ministration of either the Word or Sacraments. Accordingly the principle of 'open ministry' was henceforth advocated by him, and he proposed to one of his friends, Mr. J. G. Bellett, that the members of their devotional meeting should have a private celebration of the Lord's Supper every Sunday. The proposal was assented to by his friends, and thus the foundations of the sect were laid. Before long a society formed on similar principles arose at Plymouth, with which city we have seen Mr. Groves had been closely connected, and another at Teignmouth in Devonshire, where also he had some intimate friends. Among those who became members of the Society at Plymouth, at the time of its first formation, the name of Mr. Benjamin W. Newton is conspicuous. He was then a clergyman of the Church of England, and Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. His position and abilities secured him a leading place among the Brethren at this centre, and for a considerable period he exercised a kind of presidency there. Owing probably to his influence, the principle of open ministry was never allowed full play in their assemblies, and something resembling Church order was kept up. An attempt was made at one period to persuade the Brethren at Dublin to fall in with this arrangement, but they regarded it as an infringement of their principles, and declined to accede to the request. The Society at Teignmouth, of which Mr. Müller and Mr. Craik were prominent members, removed to Bristol soon after it was formed, and there they purchased a chapel, called Bethesda, for receiving their converts and holding their assemblies.

But, notwithstanding their novel views on the subject of ministry, the members of these Societies did not as yet formally separate from the bodies to which they had previously belonged, but continued to frequent the churches or chapels of their original communion. As yet the position they occupied was regarded by themselves as rather supplementary than adverse to existing agencies, and so

¹ Ryland's *Life of Dr. Kitto*, p. 292.

far was not altogether unlike that which had been assumed by the early Methodists of the previous century. Their leading doctrines at this period of their history may be briefly summed up as follows. They regarded the second coming of our Blessed Lord as the great hope of the Church. They dwelt much on the necessity of unity to those who would prepare to meet Him, and considered that that unity was secured by the presence of the Holy Ghost, quite apart from and independently of any special form of ecclesiastical organisation. The unearthly character of the Church was dwelt upon with an earnestness, which betokened a recoil from the prevailing Erastianism of the day. A return to what they regarded as the original principles of ministry was urged as desirable, but not enforced as necessary—while at the same time the necessity of a spiritual ministry was strongly insisted on. In addition to this they maintained the paramount superiority of Christian privilege and blessing over those belonging to even the greatest saints of earlier dispensations—a truth which, though clearly recognised in the New Testament, had for some time lost its proper place in popular teaching, but was now beginning to reassert itself in other places besides Plymouth, Bristol, and Dublin, and in other societies besides those of the Brethren.

Such then was their position, when in 1832, the Society of Dublin was joined by the man, who was destined to give the movement an unexpected direction, to develop its principles, to organise its powers, and to leave upon it, in a degree rarely attained by party leaders, the impress of his own character and opinions. Mr. John Nelson Darby appears to have been all along a man of great religious earnestness, of very strong convictions, and of great fearlessness and courage in asserting them. Added to these qualifications he possessed a most imperious will, which has made itself felt far and wide, and is very apparent in his writings. At the time he joined the Brethren, he, like Mr. Newton, was a clergyman of the Church, and had been serving for some time in an Irish curacy. He seems to have experienced various phases of belief, for he tells us that at one time he passed 'in the deepest way,' though 'in a legal spirit,' through 'what has since been called Puseyism,' by which expression he explains himself to mean 'an elaborate system of devotedness, sacraments, and church-going';¹ in this system, however, he tells us he could find no peace. At last there dawned upon him the conviction of his

¹ *Collected Works*, vol. i. p. 55.

own personal union with our Blessed Lord. This truth, to use his own expression, 'brought him out of the Establishment,' for he saw that the true Church must consist of those who were thus personally united to Christ. This account of his secession is valuable. For, first, it shows how very little he had grasped the principles of the communion to which he had belonged, and next, it exhibits that same tendency which has since shown itself among his followers, to confuse the *fact* of a Christian's union with our Lord with his own *personal consciousness* of it.

His accession proved, as we have said, to be an era in the history of the movement. The tendency to a formal schism, which had shown itself to some extent already in the acts and writings of the Brethren, soon resulted in fact. The principle of open ministry had hitherto been advocated as desirable: it was soon to be enforced as necessary. The Church and all other religious bodies were denounced as hopelessly corrupt, and the saints were earnestly exhorted to come out from among them and be separate. The societies, which had originally been started as aids in the spiritual life, soon began to put forward the lofty claims of being the only true expression of the assembly of God—the only sure ground of union for the divided followers of Christ.

Little opposition seems to have been raised by the Brethren at the time to this unlooked-for development of their principles. Indeed it secured for them a definite standing ground, such as they had not possessed before, and as such would naturally be acquiesced in even by some who would not have initiated it. But in the year 1836, we find Mr. Groves, who had been for some years abroad, remonstrating seriously with Mr. Darby on the change that had taken place. The Societies, he said, had lowered themselves from heaven to earth by abandoning the position of witnesses *for* the truth for that of witnesses *against* what they considered error; and he ventured to prophesy, that before long they would find all the evils of the systems, from which they had separated, springing up among themselves. The warning, however, produced no effect, and after a few more years of comparative harmony, a dispute, which has proved to be a lasting one, broke out among them. Mr. Darby, it appears, had long before this quitted Dublin and joined the Society at Plymouth, and it was between him and Mr. Newton, about the year 1845, that the dispute first arose. As the second coming of our Blessed Lord had all along held a prominent place in the teaching of the Brethren, they naturally gave great attention to the study of prophecy, and

appear to have been in some cases very dogmatic in their interpretation of it. Mr. Darby propounded a theory, which has since been known as 'The Secret Rapture of the Saints.' Our Lord's coming for His Church, it was said, would be invisible to the eye of flesh, the Saints would be caught up to meet Him in the air without the knowledge of the world at large—they would be missed and sought for, but their place would be found no more. Mr. Newton took alarm at these new notions, and uttered some strong remonstrances, both in public and in private, against this and other ideas which were springing up among the Brethren. This led to prolonged and acrimonious controversy, and divided the Society at Plymouth into two hostile factions. At this time, the Society numbered among its members the late Dr. Tregelles, who has left us an account of the events which followed. The opponents of Mr. Newton responded to his attack by charging him with heresy, on account of some expressions he had employed in controversy with the Irvingites some years before, which were thought to imply unsound opinions as to the cardinal doctrine of our Lord's humanity. The paper containing these expressions had been in circulation ever since its first publication without any objection being raised against it. When at length the question was mooted, Mr. Newton at once withdrew the pamphlet, and earnestly repudiated the meaning which had been attached to his words. But all was of no avail—evil had been allowed within the Society, and had not been judged. Mr. Darby raised the cry of separation, seceded with all his followers, and set up a 'table' in another part of Plymouth. The whole controversy, as recorded by the partisans of both sides, presents us with a most unedifying spectacle, and is remarkable as occurring in a Society, which had pointed the finger of scorn at the divisions of Christendom, and professed to have discovered the true ground, on which the followers of Christ might hold undisturbed communion. But the area of the controversy was to be still further enlarged. Mr. Darby and his followers called on the Brethren at all other centres to join in the condemnation of Mr. Newton, and to exclude him and all who sympathised with him from 'the breaking of bread.' The chief opposition to this demand was raised at Bristol, where the Brethren, without assenting to, or even agreeing with, the particular opinions of Mr. Newton, did not feel it their duty to act as judges in the matter. Forthwith, they were denounced as indifferent to blasphemies against Christ,¹ and, together with all

¹ *Bethesdaism*, p. 310. Darby's *Collected Works*, vol. iv.

elsewhere who sided with them, were formally excommunicated by Mr. Darby at Bethesda Chapel.

From this time forth the Brethren parted into two distinct camps ; and the Bristol party, with those who agreed with them, became known as the 'Open Brethren,' and held communion with the members of other Christian bodies. They are not formed into one distinct society, and their different assemblies are entirely independent of each other. As to doctrine, many of them are still followers of Mr. Darby, but there is no one system of doctrine generally received among them.

The Darbyites, or Exclusive Brethren, on the other hand, are a very numerous and well-organised body. They are to be found in all the principal towns of the United Kingdom. They are largely represented in America, and have adherents in all the strongholds of Continental Protestantism. They still keep up their indignant protest against what they call Bethesdaism, and rigidly exclude from communion all who sympathise with it. Mr. Darby reigns supreme among them ; his writings, though by no means what we should call easy reading, exercise unbounded influence, and practically form, on most points, their authorised exposition of Holy Scripture. Unlike the 'Open Brethren,' they have produced a large number of writers, and it is mainly through this body that the principles of Brethrenism are being disseminated far and wide. It is with them, therefore, that we shall have chiefly to do when we come to speak of doctrine.

We need not follow the history of the Brethren further ; but before we enter upon an investigation of their teaching, it will be necessary to establish a statement which we made on an earlier page. We asserted that the Plymouth movement was to be regarded as part of a great reaction against the divided state of English Christendom, and that the great object of its supporters was the restoration of visible unity to the followers of Christ. This assertion may have startled some of our readers, and it may well occasion surprise ; for the very sectarian tone of some later publications of the Brethren, and the decidedly schismatical character of their position, and of their dealings with other communions, would naturally lead us to the belief, that division rather than unity was the object at which they aimed : it is important, therefore, to show from their own writings, that the assertion we have made is a true one. We will ask our readers' attention to the following extracts. In a pamphlet published nearly forty years ago, Mr. Darby writes as follows :¹—

¹ *Reflections on the Present Ruin of the Church.*

'At this time the Lord's purpose is to gather, as well as to save, to realise unity, not merely in the heavens, where the purposes of God shall surely be accomplished, but here upon earth, by the one Spirit sent down from heaven. By one Spirit were we all baptized into one body. This is undeniably the truth concerning the Church as set forth in the word. . . . The gathering together of all the children of God in one body is plainly according to the mind of God in His word.'

And again, in another pamphlet :¹—

'The need of union is felt now by every right-minded Christian. . . . This need is felt wherever the Spirit of God acts, so as to make the Saints value grace, and truth, and one body.'

And lest any should suppose that the one body here referred to is what is commonly called the Church Invisible, we are told by Mr. Darby elsewhere :²—

'The Church Invisible is no Scriptural or tangible idea. It is an invention particularly of S. Augustine, to conciliate the awful wickedness of the professing Church with the truth and godliness necessary to the true Christian. "Ye are the light of the world;" what is the use of an invisible light?'

Other statements equally strong, as to the paramount necessity of visible unity, may be found in the pages of other writers among the Brethren, but we will content ourselves with these utterances of an acknowledged leader, and will now proceed to investigate the *chief* distinctive features of their teaching. We shall consider—

- I. Their ideas as to the Church, and the Christian ministry.
- II. Their view of the moral law in its relation to Christians.
- III. Their teaching as to Justification and Sanctification.

I. They start with the assumption that the Church throughout the world is in a state of hopeless ruin. The dispensation, they say, has failed, and its restoration is not only beyond the power of man, but contrary to the will of God.³ This failure, we are assured, is quite in accordance with what we know of the history of former dispensations, from Adam to Moses. All alike have failed, and that not after a long period of trial, but in some measure from the very beginning, and we find from sacred history that they have never been restored, but simply replaced by others. This alone might lead us not

¹ *Separation from Evil, God's Principle of Unity*, p. 1.

² *Law*, p. 15.

³ *On the Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations*.

to expect the restoration of our own—to say nothing of attempting to restore it ourselves: the first would imply that God is willing to restore it; the second, that He has authorised us to do so. But we have stronger ground than analogy to go upon. The prophecies of the New Testament as to the future fortunes of the Church, uniformly represent the dispensation as a failure; evil men and seducers arise—ungodly men bring in damnable heresies—denying the Lord who bought them, and turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and these evils are to wax worse and worse until the end; and even if these statements seem to fall short of the conclusion to which they point, there is, we are told, one more direct intimation of the coming ruin. S. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, uses these solemn words, ‘Behold, then, the goodness and severity of God, on them which fell severity, towards thee goodness if thou continue in His goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.’ On this passage Mr. Darby takes his stand; everything, he urges, is here made to depend on the Church continuing in the goodness of God. The Church has not done so, and therefore the end is sure.¹

‘We live,’ he says, ‘in an apostasy hastening to its final consummation instead of a church or dispensation which God is sustaining by His faithfulness of grace.’ ‘The kingdom of heaven spoken of in the 13th chapter of S. Matthew was, indeed,’ says Mr. Mackintosh, ‘set up in truth and simplicity, a real thing, though small, but has now, through Satan’s crafty working, become a corrupt mass, though outwardly a far-spreading, showy, popular thing in the earth, gathering all sorts under the shadow of its patronage.’

It is now compared by him to ‘a wide morass,’ and must be carefully distinguished from the true ‘assembly of God.’²

But, besides furnishing us with this terrible picture of the present state of Christendom, the Brethren have been at pains to inquire into its causes, and as their opinions on this point have a very close bearing on the course they have seen fit to adopt, we must lend an attentive ear to what they say.

Mr. Darby,³ indeed, in his eagerness to show that the dispensation has failed from the commencement, does not scruple to throw considerable blame on the twelve Apostles themselves.⁴ ‘The command,’ he tells us, ‘on which the dispensation hung, viz. “Go ye and disciple all nations,” was, in the revealed

¹ *On the Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations*, vol. i. p. 140.

² *The Assembly of God*, p. 15.

³ *The Apostasy of the Successive Dispensations. Works*, vol. i. p. 195.

⁴ *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 196.

testimony of God, unfulfilled by those to whom it was committed.' But as we have not found this accusation echoed by his followers, we the more readily turn to a point on which there seems to be a general agreement. One chief source of corruption in the Church is to be found, according to the Darbyites, in the existence and operation of an ordained ministry. 'The system,' Mr. Darby tells us, 'is wrong ; it substitutes man for God.' 'The dispensational standing of the Church in the world depends wholly on the power and presence of the Holy Ghost, and the very notion of a clergyman contradicts His title and power.' To the same effect is the testimony of Mr. Mackintosh. 'We see human authority exercised in that sphere in which Divine authority alone should be acknowledged. It is man set up in Christ's place.'

Nor is the office only evil in itself, its practical working is evil also. Making allowance for undoubted exceptions, Mr. Darby still holds that the exercise of the office has not tended to the good of the Church. As a general rule, the clergy have in all ages and all places been the great hinderers of the work of God ; they have marked with the brand of schism every attempt to do God's work which has not emanated from themselves, and have thus acted like those who in the days of old ascribed the miracles of Christ to Satan.

But not only is the existence of an ordained ministry regarded as in itself evil, and the fruitful source of evil : it is also the great stumbling-block which prevents all other evils which the sin and folly of man have brought into the Church from finding a cure. It has 'become the lever of apostasy against the children of God.' 'The doctrine of succession and all its accompaniments becomes the stamp and mark of recognised and sanctioned, because perpetuated apostasy ; for if the Church has failed, the provision for its perpetuation becomes the provision for the perpetuation of the failure, and the maintenance of the object of the Lord's sure judgment.'

Such then being the miserable state of the Catholic Church, there next emerges the practical question, What under these circumstances are Christians who desire unity to do ? The answer of the Brethren is very simple, Come out from among them and be ye separate. 'God,'¹ says Mr. Darby, 'is the sole source and centre of unity, and He is working in the midst of evil to produce an unity, of which He is centre and spring. But He is of purer eyes than to behold evil. His method, then, of gathering is to separate the called from

¹ *Separation from Evil, God's Principle of Unity*, p. 10.

evil.' Separation from evil, therefore, argues Mr. Darby, 'is the first element of unity.' Seeing then that the Catholic Church, together with all other Christian communities, is, according to the hypothesis of the Brethren, in a state of hopeless corruption, separation from it and them is the first essential; seeing too that the existence of an ordained ministry has served at once to augment and to stereotype that corruption, the principle of an ordained ministry must be abandoned. Men may indeed be saved, we are told, without these trenchant measures, but without them they cannot attain that visible unity which Christians were intended to enjoy.

But a society cannot rest on mere negations, nor can separation form of itself any ground of union.¹ We must consider, therefore, the principles by which the Brethren are guided in their task of reconstruction. Our Blessed Lord, they say, is the one centre of unity to all His followers; He has promised to be present wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, and they infer that the true Church, or, to use their favourite expression, the true 'assembly of God' on earth, consists of those who, apart from all ecclesiastical organisation, are gathered by the Holy Ghost round Him to worship and hold communion with His Father. It consists exclusively, in theory at least, of persons already saved. 'We do not enter the assembly,' says Mr. Mackintosh, 'in order to be saved, but as those who are already saved.' And again:

'It is not an institution set on foot for the purpose of providing salvation for sinners, nor yet of providing for their religious wants. It is a saved living body gathered by the Holy Ghost to make known to principalities and powers in the heavenlies the manifold wisdom of God, and to declare to the whole universe the all-sufficiency of the name of Jesus.'

In every assembly gathered on these principles the Brethren say the Holy Ghost presides—He is the true Vicar of Christ—the one only dispenser of exhortation, edification, comfort, and His Presidency renders the appointment of any human president not only unnecessary, but wrong. To permit such appointment is, as far as in us lies, to hamper the operation of the Holy Spirit and to encroach upon His jurisdiction; nay, it is denounced by one of them as 'sheer unbelief, an open insult to the Divine Presence.'²

But it must not be gathered from this that the Brethren

¹ This is fully recognised in Mr. Darby's pamphlet, *Grace the Power of Unity and Gathering*, though partially lost sight of in the earlier paper quoted above.

² *The Assembly of God*, p. 27.

are prepared to dispense with human agency altogether. All that they insist on is, that those who speak in the assembly should receive their appointment immediately from the Holy Ghost, without any intervention on the part of man. In theory indeed they maintain that all Christians, being Priests unto God and partakers of the one Spirit, have an equal right to minister; but in practice they restrict this right to those who possess the requisite qualifications, such qualifications being regarded as a sufficient mark of the Spirit's appointment. A person who possesses them is not only permitted, but bound to use them, while the assembly, on the other hand, is bound to recognise them. And here the question necessarily arises, Who is to judge whether this or that brother really possesses the requisite gifts? Himself or the assembly? The question is not an easy one for the Brethren to settle, for if the man himself is to have the power of deciding, the assembly, one would think, must often have a great deal to endure; if, on the other hand, the assembly is to judge, then the Brethren do, whatever they may say, elect their own ministers. It appears that the former of the two alternatives has been tried, for one of their writers says, 'He who believes himself to be led by the Spirit may address the meeting;' but the results of this practice do not seem to have been encouraging, if we may judge from the experience of their founder, Mr. A. N. Groves.

'I have seen enough,' he says, 'of the plan of every one doing what is right in his own eyes, and then calling it the Spirit's order, to be convinced that it is a delusion, and I consider it far more dishonouring to God than when no profession is made;' and accordingly he resolved to join no assembly which had not some constituted rule.

Mr. Mackintosh, too, admits the 'errors, evils, and abuses' attending the system he upholds,¹ and draws a sad picture of the troubles to which the assembly is liable; but he regards these acknowledged drawbacks as only so many proofs of the truth of the position, showing, as he thinks they do, how 'the devil hates such an assembly,' and he considers that they are

¹ In the *Assembly of God*, p. 28, Mr. Mackintosh says: 'If an assembly should be troubled by the intrusion of ignorant and foolish men—men who have never yet measured themselves in the presence of God—men who boldly overleap the wide domain over which common sense, good taste, and moral propriety preside, and then vainly talk of being led by the Holy Ghost—restless men who *will* be at something, and who keep the assembly in a continual state of nervous apprehension not knowing what is to come next; should any assembly be thus grievously afflicted, what should they do?'—what indeed!

to be met, not by abandoning the position and 'falling back on man and his wretched order,' but by looking to God to keep order in His own house.

But, however strongly they may cling to the theory of open ministry, they are, for the most part, obliged in practice to make the assembly decide whether its members really possess the gift to which they lay claim; but, when once this is done, the system they have established lies open to the very objection which they bring against all other systems, that 'the possessor of a gift dare not exercise it without the seal, the sanction, the authority of man.'

But since the Brethren profess to be guided in all their teaching and practice by the Scriptures alone, we are naturally led to ask, how do they reconcile the system they have introduced with the teaching of the New Testament? It is true that we find there a full recognition of our Blessed Lord as the centre round which His people are gathered, and of the Holy Ghost as the power by which their union with Him is initiated and sustained; but then we find side by side with these truths—nay, as one of the expressions of them—an ordained organised ministry. We have 'the glorious company of the Apostles,' possessing, in addition to its miraculous endowments, the power of ordination, and spiritual jurisdiction. We have elders 'ordained in every Church,' holding from them the oversight of different portions of the flock, and we have the deacons discharging primarily indeed the more secular duties incumbent on the ministry, but employed from time to time in higher services as necessity might require, and we have specific regulations laid down in some of the *latest* of S. Paul's Epistles as to the qualifications required in those who were admitted to these offices.

Now to this the Brethren reply, all these offices which existed in the Apostolic age were ordained and constituted by the Holy Ghost Himself, and therefore the exercise of them could involve no encroachment upon His jurisdiction. Nay, they were among the means employed by Him for the edification of the Church and the conversion of the world. But they add—assuming the very point which they require to prove—none but the Apostles and those appointed by them had any power to fill up these offices, and the attempt on the part of succeeding generations to do so has been all along presumptuous, and has resulted in a mere lifeless, powerless imitation of the original institution. Now in order to give this assumption any real weight, it would be necessary to assume further, that the Holy Spirit withdrew his life-giving

presence from the ministry He had *confessedly* ordained, as soon as the last of those who had received ordination from the immediate successors of the Apostles had been taken to their rest; but if this was indeed to be the case—if the ministry, which the Holy Ghost had instituted and blessed, and which extended through the whole of Christendom, was intended to collapse entirely in the third generation, and to have its place supplied by a system utterly unlike it—it would surely be only reasonable to expect that some warning of the coming change should have been given us in Scripture; but seeing that not a word of such warning can be found from one end of the New Testament to the other, we are bound, *even on the principles of the Brethren themselves*, to conclude that no such change was intended to take place. And when once we take into consideration the fact so often asserted in Scripture, that the Spirit was to abide with the Church from age to age, we are surely justified in believing what the Church has always taught, that the ministry He ordained was to remain also, 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the Body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the Faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'¹

Tried by the test of Scripture—the one test to which they appeal—the case of the Brethren in this matter of ministry appears to be worse than weak. But even when driven off all their other points of defence, they still insist that the New Testament affords them one sure standing ground.

There was an oasis in the desert of the Apostolic age, in which, according to their belief, the ecclesiastical organisation prevailing elsewhere was laid aside, and 'the true principles of ministry' were allowed their full play. They appeal to the Church of Corinth. But these principles, if indeed, as the Brethren insist, they were accepted by that Church, do not seem, from the accounts we have received, to have worked very happily there. They did not prevent the complacent tolerance of the grossest moral evil in the case of the incestuous person; they did not prevent disorder and confusion in their use of the spiritual gifts; they did not prevent the glutton and the drunkard coming together with the saint to the Table of the Lord. We think that a more unhappy illustration could scarcely have been chosen than that to which the Brethren have been driven by the necessity of justi-

¹ Ephesians v. 12, 13.

fyng their position from Scripture; and, in addition to all its other disadvantages, it fails in one most important particular. For the Corinthians, with all their faults, had not, like the Brethren, separated from the Church.

But even if the Corinthian assemblies had been as reverent and as orderly as we know them to have been the reverse, they would have afforded no precedent for the proceedings of the Brethren. For the Corinthian Christians possessed those miraculous gifts which in the early days of the dispensation so often attested the presence of the Spirit. They spoke with tongues; they prophesied; and these gifts were such as by their *very nature* would at once be recognised by the assembly at large, or even if there should have arisen among them one who pretended to gifts which he did not possess, there were 'discerners of spirits' to expose the fraud. Whereas in the case of the Brethren, there are no such miraculous gifts to be found, nor is there any satisfactory means of deciding even as to the ordinary powers possessed by the members of their assemblies; so that the example to which they refer us breaks down completely.

II. We now pass on to another peculiarity of the Brethren—their teaching as to the moral law in its relation to the Christian; and this needs the more to be dwelt upon, because their views on this point lie at the root of some other peculiarities which we shall have to notice.

Amid indignant protests against the charge of Antinomianism—amid earnest expressions of a longing after holiness—the Brethren still constantly assert that the moral law is *no* rule of life for a Christian man. In his paper on 'Justification in the Risen Christ,' Mr. C. Stanley says: 'I do not find the law ever presented as the rule of life or walk to the risen child of God.' Mr. Mackintosh says: 'It is evident that a sinner cannot be justified by the works of the law, and it is equally evident that moral law is not the rule of the believer's life.' So, too, Mr. Darby, after speaking of the Christian seeking those things which are above, adds, 'The law has nothing to do with this heavenly life;' and again, 'When it is said, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" the law, it is a false deduction to say, that I am come to call upon Christians to fulfil it.' This strange teaching they thus defend:—

(a.) They point us to those passages in S. Paul's Epistles in which he so emphatically enforces the two great truths (1) that the law cannot justify one who has transgressed its precepts; (2) that it cannot impart to a fallen vitiated nature the powers of a new life—for to one or other of these truths all

the Apostles' strongest statements may be referred—nay, *must* be referred, if their context is to have any voice in determining their meaning. But the Brethren decline to see any difference between being 'dead to the law,' or 'delivered from' it, as a source of life or of justification, and being dead to it as a rule of conduct. 'Scripture,' says Mr. Darby, 'does not think of saying, you are not under the law in one way, but you are in another: you are not for justification, but you are for a rule of life; but it declares "you are not under law."' Again, Mr. Mackintosh, after quoting the words, 'the commandment which was ordained to life I found to be unto death,' infers,¹ 'It evidently did not prove a rule of *life* to him;' and further, 'Whoever "*I*" represents in this chapter was alive until the law came in, and then he died. Hence, therefore, the law could not have been a rule of life to him; yea, it was the very opposite, even a rule of death.' The fallacy involved in this reasoning is too obvious to need comment.

(b.) Further, the Brethren maintain that to make the moral law the rule of a Christian's life, is to bring him under the curse. 'The Christian,' says Mr. Darby, 'has sin in him as a human being, and, alas! fails; and if law applies to him, he is under a curse.' 'The law,' says Mr. Mackintosh, 'rules and curses a man as long as he lives. It knows no such thing as a distinction between the regenerated and unregenerated man, it curses all who attempt to stand before it.' Here we have another instance of the liberties they take with the language of S. Paul. He had maintained that as many as were of the works of the law—as many, that is, as depended on those works for justification—brought themselves under the curse, because they failed to fulfil the only condition under which the law could justify, viz., that of entire obedience. The Brethren infer that the only way to escape that curse is to get rid of the law, not merely as a ground of justification, but as a rule of conduct.

(c.) They further hold that the moral law was imposed *for the first time* when the tables of stone were given to Moses. This code is described by Mr. Darby as 'the only law God ever gave (save the prohibition to eat the forbidden fruit).' From this of course the inference is easy, that being part and parcel of the Mosaic dispensation, it was to pass away with it. Adam, according to them, while yet in Eden, was without law, with the exception of the prohibition mentioned above. He was simply *innocent*; not created in righteousness and

¹ *A Scriptural Enquiry into the True Nature of the Sabbath, Law, and Christian Ministry*, p. 10.

holiness : he could not have righteousness or holiness, for they imply the knowledge of good and evil. Again, from Adam to Moses men were not placed under law. They had responsibility, indeed, and moral obligation, but no law. They could sin, but they could not transgress ; for transgression implies the existence of a law, and sin, according to the Brethren, does not. In short, the teaching of the Brethren on this point involves an entire misconception as to the nature, the origin, the immutability, of the moral law. They fail to see that it is incapable of abolition, because it arises necessarily out of the fundamental relations, 1st, between man and God, 2nd, between man and man. They fail to see that Christianity, having strengthened and intensified these relations, by bringing us nearer to God and nearer to one another, has made the moral law in all its fullness more obligatory than ever.

There are passages, indeed, in the writings of the Brethren in which they seem to be fully aware of all this. Mr. Darby, in the pamphlet from which we have quoted so often, makes copious admissions which go far towards neutralising that portion of his teaching upon which we have been dwelling ; for instance, he speaks as follows (*Law*, p. 25) :—

‘That the written word, from one end to the other, guides the new nature, and leads it in obedience, that is blessedly true ; that when born of God, which I am not by the law, that life is formed, directed, yea commanded, by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God, and especially by those of Christ . . . I own with my whole heart.’

And again, ‘That a Christian should walk according to the precepts of the New Testament, and all the Divine light he can get from the Old Testament, be it the Ten Commandments or anything else, no consistent or right-minded Christian could for a moment deny.’ We welcome these admissions gladly, but our readers will not fail to observe that they are made in direct defiance of the thesis Mr. Darby has undertaken to defend¹—that the moral law is not the rule of a Christian’s life.

But his followers do not always stop short in this way, and Mr. Mackintosh’s *Thoughts on the Confirmation Vows* go far beyond his leader’s teaching. He will not allow even the Israelites to keep the law, or at all events to undertake to do so. The solemn promise of ancient Israel, ‘all that the Lord saith unto us we will do,’ is denounced by him as ‘proud

¹ See *Law*, p. 1.

legality,' and is said to have led the Almighty to alter the whole course of His dealings with them. Not even the sentence of Divine approval, 'they have well said *all* that they have spoken,' is sufficient to clear them in Mr. Mackintosh's eyes—for this approval only extends, according to him, to their confession of their inability to endure the Divine Presence—as though the confession had not been accompanied by a repetition of the promise, 'we will hear it and do it.' Accordingly, Mr. Mackintosh proceeds to attack in no measured terms what he calls 'The Confirmation Vow of the Establishment.' This he compares to 'the promissory note of a bankrupt,' and says that it involves 'a plain denial of the great fundamental truths of the Christian religion.' It is 'a total setting aside of grace,' 'a tarnishing of the brightness of God's salvation,' 'an insult to the righteousness of God,' 'a plain and palpable apostasy from the religion of faith.' Vainly do we urge that we make the promise not in our own strength, but in dependence upon Divine grace—this, we are told, 'will not at all alter the matter,' 'for there cannot be such a thing as dependence upon grace, when people are placing themselves directly under the law.' To ask for grace under these circumstances is to ask for grace 'to enable us to subvert entirely the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ.' These passages show to what lengths some of the Brethren are prepared to go in maintaining their peculiar notions as to the moral law.

(d.) But there is one more argument urged by them in defence of this position on which we must say a few words. Christ, they say, is our rule of life—and by making the law fill that office, we put it in His place. The writers of the New Testament, it is urged, put Christ and the law in contrast—and accordingly Mr. Darby says, 'you cannot be under obligation to Christ and to the law.' Here we have a repetition of the fallacy already noticed above. Christ is opposed to the law by the Apostle—as the ground of justification, and as the source of life. *He* has done for us that which the law did not, could not do, and, therefore, to look to the law for that which the law *cannot* do, but which Christ *has* done, is, of course, to abandon the Christian ground altogether; it is 'to fall from grace.' But in inferring from this that the law and Christ are opposed to each other as rules of life, the Brethren are not only introducing into their conclusion an element not contained in their premisses, but they are ignoring the relations subsisting between the law and the life of our Blessed Lord. That life, we believe, exhibits to us the perfect working of

that law, in it we behold the solitary instance of an entire response on the part of man to all those claims both of God and man, of which the moral law is the expression. Therefore, in the life of Christ, we see the moral law not abolished, but 'established' for ever as the rule of life for man.

But the prejudice of the Brethren against this idea of law has not only introduced an element of contradiction into their practical teaching—it has also had a serious effect on their theology. Thus the perfect obedience of our Lord to all the requirements of the law, while admitted as a fact, is not allowed its proper place in the economy of redemption. That obedience, we are told, had no part in His atoning work. On the contrary, they assert, that it was His obedience to suffering, not His obedience to law, which wrought our redemption, as though the moral character of His sufferings as man did not arise from the fact, that they were undergone out of that love to God and man, which is the fulfilling of the law.

III. But, further, the Brethren appear to us to have fallen into grave errors on the two important subjects of justification and sanctification, and this is the more to be regretted, because their teaching on these points has certainly helped to bring to light one aspect of the truth, which some previous systems had lost sight of. We allude to the connection of both gifts with the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord. Holding in common with other Christians that our Saviour's death was the source of both alike, they maintain, at the same time, that our personal possession of them arises from our union with Him in resurrection. Here, as in so many other points, we see tokens of a reaction from the teaching of the preceding period. The Resurrection of our Saviour had long been regarded mainly in its evidential aspect—as a proof of His Divinity—of the acceptance of His sacrifice, as an event which, once recognised as historically true, removed all *à priori* presumption against miracles. But while these by no means unimportant aspects of the Resurrection had received full attention, its place in the economy of Redemption implied in the words 'risen with Christ,' 'saved by His Life,' 'the power of His Resurrection,' had been to a great extent forgotten. It has been one great work of the last fifty years to restore that doctrine to its proper place. We see this distinctly in both the contemporaneous movements, and it would be unjust not to recognise the fact that the Brethren have had a share in bringing about this desirable result. In a paper on the Resurrection, Mr. Darby says:—

'The saints are regarded by God as risen with Christ, and consequently perfectly justified from all their sins . . . but how do they participate in blessings so great? It is by partaking of that life in the power of which Christ rose from the dead. Thus it is I share in the righteousness of God, by being quickened with the life wherewith Christ was raised from the dead coming out of the grave, all our trespasses being forgiven.'

But unfortunately our satisfaction ends where it begins—for when we look a little closer, we find their doctrine on both these subjects weighted with such serious errors as to deprive the recovered truth of well-nigh all its practical value. To speak first of justification. Their doctrine on this subject is hampered by a Calvinistic view of final perseverance. The believer once risen with Christ is freed from all further anxiety about the future; he is in no danger of drawing back to perdition, and so under no necessity of working out his salvation with fear and trembling.

Further, their theory is mutilated by the failure to recognise baptism as the ordained 'means whereby' we are made partakers of the resurrection life of our Blessed Lord, the ordained 'pledge to assure us thereof.' Casting this aside, they look about them for other means and other pledges, and too often end by taking refuge in their feelings. Some moment of awakened religious consciousness is fixed upon as the period when they pass from death unto life. Until that moment is reached, no efforts on their part can avail them anything; nay, such efforts are not without the guilt of presumption,—such '*doing ends in death.*' And thus the practical outcome of the system is that the many are encouraged in spiritual sloth, under the idea that they are not partakers of the grace of God, while the few who have passed through these experiences are led to regard them as a discharge from all further obedience to law, and as a guarantee of their share in the final glory of the Redeemed. They utterly ignore the fact that the hearty strenuous effort to do God's will is at once the true measure of the extent to which we have profited by His grace, and the most effectual safeguard against the fate of those who, having first 'received the word with joy,' afterwards succumb to the trials which follow its reception.

And this brings us to one more deficiency in their theory of justification. By repudiating the moral law as their rule of life, they have deprived Christians of the chief means of discovering their *present* standing before God. It is quite true, of course, that the law is not made for a righteous man; but the very best men have in this life quite enough lawlessness

and disobedience in them to render the law as a rule not only desirable but necessary; and those who, under the pretence of exalting grace, deprive us of this rule, incur enormous responsibilities. They depart altogether from the line laid down by our Blessed Lord in the recorded teaching of His ministry. They sacrifice the whole moral teaching of the Apostolical Epistles to their own arbitrary, one-sided interpretation of some few passages in S. Paul. They deprive the Christian of the greatest practical safeguard; and, if the experience of the past is any guide as to the future, we must have grave fears for our country if such teaching is to prevail. On this subject of Justification we can cordially recommend Mr. Sadler's admirable little work, entitled *Justification of Life*. It investigates every statement of the New Testament respecting this doctrine; its main object being to bring to that test the teachings of Revivalists and Plymouth Brethren on this subject; and the writer is fully justified in his conclusion that their doctrines on this point 'are so diametrically contrary to those of our Lord and His Apostles, that it would require a new revelation with new credentials to commend such doctrines to those who believe in the New Testament as being a real revelation of the will of God.'

But if their view of Justification labours under all these drawbacks, their view of Sanctification labours under more. The Antinomianism, which we have noted in their treatment of the former subject, instead of being neutralised is only strengthened and intensified by their treatment of the latter. They deny that sanctification is in itself a progressive thing. They assert it to be 'an immediate, a complete, an eternal, a divine work;' 'it is done in a moment.' The instant a sinner is united to Christ he is perfectly sanctified. Mr. Mackintosh is the chief expounder of these views, and, lest we should accidentally misrepresent him, he shall express in his own words the chief ground on which he rests them. After blaming those who speak of sanctification 'as a progressive work, in virtue of which our old nature is made better,' he proceeds:—

'The Word of God never once teaches us that the Holy Ghost has for His object the improvement of our old nature—that nature which we inherit by natural birth from fallen Adam. The Apostle expressly declares that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, &c." This one passage is conclusive on the point, for if the natural man can neither receive nor know the things of the Spirit of God, then how can that natural man be sanctified by the Holy Ghost? Other passages might be adduced to prove that the

design of the Spirit's operations is not to sanctify the flesh. . . . An utterly ruined thing can never be sanctified. . . .

The old nature being thus incapable of improvement or sanctification, Mr. Mackintosh concludes that sanctification is 'not a process,' 'not a gradual work,' 'not progressive.'

On this strange teaching we have to remark :—

(i.) That Mr. Mackintosh misunderstands altogether the meaning of the expression 'the things of the Spirit of God,' as employed by the Apostle in this passage. The context makes it quite clear that S. Paul is speaking, not of the sanctifying grace of the Spirit, but of certain revelations concerning 'the things freely given us of God,' imparted by the Spirit to the *τέλειοι* among Christians. *These revelations*, he tells us, the natural man cannot receive.

But (ii.) there is an ambiguity about his use of the terms 'natural man,' or old nature. He defines it in one place as that nature which we inherit by natural birth from fallen Adam. This nature, he tells us, *cannot be sanctified*. Now if by this he means to teach that the human nature we possess, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, cannot be sanctified (and this is the only meaning which has any bearing upon his argument against progressive sanctification), we can only say that he is placing a most unheard-of limitation on the power of the Holy Ghost, and robbing of one of its chiefest glories the redeeming work of Christ. He is, moreover, placing himself directly at issue with the Apostle in his prayer for the Thessalonians, 'The very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and I pray God that your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

But if, on the other hand, by the *old man, the flesh, the old nature*, Mr. Mackintosh means simply human nature, so far as it is not subject to the Spirit of God—and this is the meaning it evidently bears in the passage he has quoted—then, to say that 'the flesh,' the 'old man,' cannot be sanctified, is simply to assert, *that human nature apart from Divine grace cannot be sanctified*—a mere truism, but having no bearing whatever on the question of progressive sanctification. Besides which, if this be indeed the meaning of the word 'flesh' in the Apostle's sense of it, the admitted presence of 'the flesh' in the regenerate man utterly overthrows the theory of the Brethren, that every believer is from the moment he is united to Christ perfectly sanctified. For it is the presence within him of something which has not yet yielded to the Spirit of God ; and we know that no man can be regarded as completely

sanctified till every imagination has been cast down, and every thought brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

There are two other arguments, on which this writer relies, which we must briefly notice. In S. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, he says that Christ is made to the believer, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption (or, as Mr. Mackintosh, we believe correctly, interprets it, resurrection).¹ Here, he says, sanctification is spoken of as a gift which is ours in Christ, and next he observes that in the order of enumeration it stands between righteousness and redemption. Thence he draws the singular conclusion that, as the two last mentioned are not progressive works, but gifts imparted in their fulness '*in a moment*,' it is illogical to place the gift which is named between them on a different footing from the other two! But it seems to have escaped his notice, that his argument, if it proves anything at all, proves a great deal too much. For does not S. Paul say that Christ is made unto us 'wisdom'? and will Mr. Mackintosh maintain that the *wisdom* imparted to the saints is not progressive? Will he assert that it is 'complete, eternal, divine'? We fear that 'the truthful experience of believers,' in which he expresses so much confidence, will scarcely bear him out in doing so.

To his remaining argument a somewhat similar objection may be raised. He appeals to the passage in Acts xxvi. 18, in which believers are spoken of as being 'sanctified by faith;' whereas the fact that a gift is received by faith, does not disprove its progressiveness, or why are we exhorted to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or why would S. Paul pray for his Philippian converts that their love might abound more and more in knowledge and in all judgment? We gladly recognise towards the close of the pamphlet some at least of the admissions we desire; but Mr. Mackintosh's statements and arguments in the earlier pages drive us to the conclusion that those admissions represent not legitimate results of his theory, but the rebellion of his better nature against it.

With such doctrines upon the two important subjects of Justification and Sanctification, we are not surprised at finding that believers are taught *not* to pray for forgiveness of sins, nor to pray for the Holy Spirit; their theory of Justification precluding the former, their theory of sanctification the latter.

We need not do more than allude to the terrible consequences which may follow if once such teaching is generally

¹ See Hooker, *E. P.* book v. ch. 54, sect. 5.

received.¹ In the case of those indeed 'who have made the system,' we may well believe that the influence of their self-created theories is counteracted by other and better principles; but in the case of those 'whom the system makes,' we shudder to contemplate the possible consequences.

It should be stated we have avoided entering upon doctrines, which we have reason for regarding as the offspring of individual eccentricities, or which from their obscure character are not likely to be widely received,² and have confined our attention to those broad features of teaching, which have characterised the movement generally. It is by the latter, rather than by the former, that the present generation is exposed to danger, and we have fulfilled our task if we have succeeded in pointing out the nature of that danger.

We have only one remark to make in conclusion. At the time when the Plymouth movement began, there was much in the religious condition of the country to give apparent justification to the desponding views expressed by the Brethren at that period. Times have altered wonderfully since then, and our Church in particular has exhibited a degree of life and activity which has astonished friends and foes alike. But it must ever be remembered that we owe that revival under God *not* to those who despaired of her restoration, and forsook her pale for some new standing ground of their own, but to those, who believing in the privileges and promises which belonged to her as a branch of the Catholic Church, resolved to make full proof of both. The former have only founded a sect; the latter have restored a Church. The former have hampered the truths they do possess by mingling them with fanciful self-chosen theories; the latter have recovered for us the fair proportions of the ancient Faith. And we cannot help thinking, that when English Churchmen of days to come look back, in the light of history, on the times in which we live, they will at least learn from them one important lesson, that the Church, however fallen, always contains within herself the means of her revival in the promises which are her sure inheritance, and will be encouraged to preserve for themselves the ancient faith in 'the unaltered shrine of primitive discipline,' and to hand down both to the generation that comes after them whole and undefiled.

¹ Reid's *Plymouth Brethrenism Unveiled and Refuted*.

² We refer to such doctrines as are involved in the distinction drawn by Mr. Darby between the *atoning* and the *non-atoning* sufferings of Christ, and between our Saviour's 'coming' and His 'appearing.' The promulgation of the former of these two theories, in 1866, caused great discontent among Mr. Darby's followers, a discontent which resulted, in some cases, in secession.

ART. VIII — THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS AND THE NATIONAL THANK-OFFERING.

1. *Ecclesiastical Commissioners (Church Building).*

(71) Return to an Order of the House of Lords, dated June 19, 1876.

(71a) Abstract of the Account of the Church Building Commission Fund from January 1, 1857, to October 31, 1876.

2. *Free and Open Church Advocate*, 1875-8.

3. *Annual Reports of the Free and Open Church Association*, 1876-8.

IT was lately rumoured among journalists that the Home Secretary was preparing a Bill to check those sins of the share-circular and the balance sheet, which have lately opened so many eyes and emptied so many pockets. But it is never easy to legislate far in advance of the moral standard of the age, and the sample of that standard on which we are about to touch after much hesitation and with great distaste, makes us fear it is sadly low, and reminds us of the Horatian maxim, *quid leges sine moribus vanæ proficiunt?* In what we are about to adduce, of course no imputation of personal cupidity or interested motive could be dreamed of for a moment; and some might, therefore, think that we reflect gratuitously on the eminent personages who point our moral. But we urge their case only as the basis of an *à fortiori* argument. If the errors we complain of really exist, where filthy lucre has no power, and in the case of officials whom we all know to be of spotless personal character, how much more may shifty doings and Punic faith be looked for in regions where doubtful motives have free play, and where it is often but a narrow line which divides the enterprise which is the health of trade from the commercial gambling which is its ruin!

In short, there is a case in which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in their capacity as trustees at once for the nation and the Church, are acting in a way which would draw down on any private trustee the stern rebuke of any Court, together, probably, with more serious consequences. We proceed to

state the case in detail. In 1856-7 they succeeded to the powers of an older Church-building Commission which had been created to administer a fund amounting to 1,500,000*l.* in two successive votes of public money. Of this fund, a remnant of 14,000*l.* odd was passed on to them, amounting in twenty years, with interest on balances, to 20,000*l.* nearly, of which total there remained yet some 7,000*l.* unexpended in October 1876. Before we look at the terms of the statute in which the money was voted, let us premise that the idea of the vote was that of a thank-offering to Almighty God on behalf of the nation, then recently delivered from the perils of the great Napoleonic struggle which closed at Waterloo. After citing the fact of the insufficiency of church accommodation for the existing population, the preamble declares it 'necessary . . . that additional churches should be erected . . . and that a certain number of *free seats* should be made therein.' The number was not fixed, but it is obvious that, if *all* the seats had been free, the maximum of compliance with the intent of the Legislature would have been attained, but that if *none* had been free, the latter part of its expressed intention would have been frustrated. The result of the first Commission's labours was as follows:¹—

Churches built	Containing accommodation for persons	Of these places the free were	Percentage of seats free
615	599,118	357,639	60

Thus 60 per cent. of the accommodation free was the interpretation put upon their duty in fulfilling the intent of the Legislature by the old Commission. It is devoutly to be wished that they had so spent every shilling of it. As it is, this *balance* has been to their successors the means of promoting a system of perpetual pew-rents. The *modus operandi* is as follows.

The new Commissioners hold that wherever they make even a 'nominal grant,' they thereby acquire the right of saddling the church thus mocked with help with a scale of pew-rents. We presume that as the chiefs of many of the higher law courts are members of the Commission, they must,

¹ We believe they began with about 70 per cent. free and dropped down to 55 in their later years. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have followed in the same mischievous direction. It is not here attempted to review the whole Church-building policy of these latter, but only their use made of the special fund in question.

in this, be borne out by the letter of the statute. The assets, save so far as interest may accrue on balances, are now, of course, stationary ; but by a skilful management of their grants, that is, by making a sufficient number of them *nominal only*, they manage to keep a balance always on hand. Thus they never allow the sacred stream to run quite dry, and if it threatened to do so, they are prepared to reduce their grants from 5*l.* to 5*s.*, as their secretary candidly stated to Mr. Beresford Hope in Committee. Being thus enabled to stave off the evil day of utter impecuniosity, they go on dropping—or not, as the case may be—their peppercorn into the hungry hand of the intending church-erector, and in return purchase—for anything from *nil* up to 5*l.*—the right of fastening a scale of pew-rents on their helpless parochial *protégés*.

The secretary, Mr. Pringle, with the most unruffled cynicism, added, that grants were made for no other purpose than that mentioned. Here is an instance. It appears that Christ Church, Beckenham, Kent, *received* we cannot say, but was debited with the receipt of a nominal grant of 5*l.* in 1876. Its total accommodation was 748 ; of these, 616 places are to let at an authorised total rent of 838*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.*, leaving just 132, or less than 18 per cent.,¹ of the places free. Thus the hapless Beckenhamites forfeited the franchise which they might have had in God's House, and never saw their 5*l.* So the clever angler lands his fish, takes the artificial minnow out of the misguided creature's mouth, and sets it spinning again to lure another victim.

The condition of rented pews, to whatever extent they prevail, tends to restrict and impede the enjoyment of a church by all classes of its parishioners. Further, the money voted by the nation may be presumed to have been for the spiritual benefit of all classes of the nation in proportion to their needs, and, therefore, most of all for those whose needs are greatest. The increase of the population in 1815–1824 was a downward growth of enormous masses tending to a state of confirmed godlessness. They had lost to a large extent all appetite for religion, and to put a price on its most elementary observance, that of public worship, was *pro tanto* to exclude them from it. Thus the restriction of pew-rents operated adversely to the great majority of those for whose benefit the grant was made, and the only way of being faithful to its spirit was by minimising pew-rents. The present Commissioners take the opposite course, and administer the

¹ The *minimum* proportion of free seats under the original Church Building Act was 20 per cent. of the entire accommodation of the Church.

fund as though the preamble had declared the necessity of 'a certain number,' not of 'free,' but of 'pew-rented seats being made therein.' The older Commission, on the contrary, according to their lights, showed at any rate a decent deference to the spirit of the Act. They were no doubt hampered by the original misconception of the Act itself, viz., that to build fabrics first and trust to endowments springing up afterwards was the best way of church-extension. But for this belief in bricks and mortar they were not responsible. It was the excusable error of the age, not of the men. The light of experience was far less abundant then than it has since become. And we do not feel disposed to be censorious on church-builders working from 1815 to 1856 on a mistaken principle, when the result gave so much as 60 per cent. of free places in the churches built. If they were not very far in advance of their age, at least they were by no means behind it. But the earliest grant made by the *present* Commissioners was, however, in 1859, or just about the time when attention was being drawn to the prevailing violation of the idea of the English parochial system through appropriation, but above all through pew-rents, by Mr. Herford, of Manchester, at the earlier Church Congresses. It is then at once singular and unsatisfactory to find that in the first decade of their inherited powers these Commissioners used them more liberally than in the last. The greater number of instances of churches built by them in which rented pews are only one-third or one-fourth of the whole accommodation are to be found in that earlier decade; and on the contrary, the greater number of instances in which that proportion is inverted or even more grossly violated is to be found in the last decade.

Thus they have done, on the whole, even worse than their predecessors, whereas they ought to have done much better; and whereas they ought to have grown in liberality with the times, have grown in narrowness. We never penned a page with greater grief. Here we see in melancholy combination all the traditional evils of a corporate body and of a bureaucracy as well; and yet looking to the individual members of whom the body is composed, it is not too much to say that in it we have the very choice and flower of public virtue, thrice winnowed from the social *residuum* around them, shielded from numerous temptations by personal, professional, and official *prestige*; and yet as soon as they come to act as a body, down falls public virtue to the *zero* of the *letter*, and it stoops to act in such fashion as we have seen. Probably not even the least sensitive of all the highly eminent persons who

form the Commission, or have formed it in times past, would have ventured, acting in and for a local sphere for which he was separately responsible, to have done what the body has thus done. But a corporation is hidebound in red tape and official parchment. Large-hearted individually as many are known to be, into the official pigeon-hole each is duly squeezed, and while each man of them, we believe sincerely, would prefer the right path, the Commission takes the wrong.

The members are selected because they individually fill posts of the highest public rank and influence. Their fellow-citizens are entitled to expect of them an example of absolute rectitude in the application of public money to the very end or ends for which it was voted. It was *not* voted to establish the pew-rent system in cases where otherwise there would be no need of it, and this is the purpose to which it is put; it *was* voted to promote the building of churches with the maximum of freedom attainable, and this is the purpose to which it is *not* put. The selfish greed of personal comfort which seeks for proprietorship (whether by purchase or fixed rent matters little) in the House which is individually God's alone, and collectively His people's, is met half-way by their proceedings, and the English laity are encouraged in the notion of making this the very corner-stone of Church extension by the very persons who ought to rebuke that spirit, not a few of whom, as individual prelates, are engaged in earnestly rebuking it.

The right of the English parishioner to accommodation in his or her parish church, is one of the most sacred and beneficent principles which the reverence, love, and wisdom of the past have bequeathed to us. If my brother values this birth-right at Esau's rate, is it for me to bid him the mess of pottage and buy it of him? But, indeed, the case is far worse than this parallel puts it, for not a penny of my pew-rent goes to benefit him in any way. I buy him out, and then enjoy the purchase-money myself, to guarantee my own accommodation. The root-principle of Christianity, as a social principle, is that of brotherhood in Christ. The first dawn of its system carried this so far that they who believed 'had all things common.' Now the opposite spirit has so far driven this out that there is not even brotherhood to be found in the House of God. In an average town or suburban parish, for every family pewed in, there are probably two or three pewed out: As in a slave-system the one who probably suffers most moral detriment next to the slave himself is the slave-owner, so here the mischief done to the parishioner who is included by

the pew-rent in the congregation is only less than to him whom it excludes.

The example set by the Commissioners infects our Church system still further. It is assumed, under the countenance which they give it, that pew-rents must be right wherever they are set up. We have no doubt that in the majority of cases where they exist they are as illegal as lotteries. But with such an august body giving them such overwhelming encouragement, who cares to impeach them? The church-wardens do what is right in their own eyes, and may shelter themselves under the shadow of the mitre in so doing.

Nor is this all, but a distinct attempt having been made in 1872¹ by the Legislature to remedy the growing evil by providing for the erection of churches which might at any rate be free from pew-rents, the Commissioners have laboured to defeat its object. To take one instance. We are informed that the Marquis of Northampton offered, at a moderate cost, a site for a church in a very poor district, but where it happened that an ample endowment existed; merely requiring that this condition of the building remaining wholly free from appropriation should appear in the title-deeds. The Commissioners refused to accept the site on these terms, Lord Northampton refused to part with the site on any others, and the chance of it was lost. How many eloquent episcopal charges have denounced the mischief of pew-rents since? But the Commission works in a groove, outside that groove it refuses to look, and so declines to encourage any better model than that set up by official routine.

We revert to the fact that the fund which they thus pervert to spread the taint and perpetuate the bane of pew-rents, is part of the national thank-offering, the last, we believe, which the nation has made, the last, we fear, which it is ever likely to make. It is committed to the hands of those who are looked upon as the living fathers of the Church, and it is so dealt with as to perpetuate an abuse which they ought to be the first to set themselves with the whole force of their influence to sweep away. But leaving abuse out of the question, what, we repeat, would be the position of a private trustee who should thus deal with trust money placed in his hands to administer? And lastly, we are constrained to add that there is a paltry spirit about the whole contrivance worthy only of an electioneering agent manufacturing fagot votes. The very

¹ The Bill was brought in by Earl Nelson; the resulting statute is known as the Church Seats Act, 1872.

notion of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners doling out a petty remnant of a fund, public but sacred, as a corban of mammon, in order to build pews and let them, professing to give a five-pound note, and that only 'nominal,' is too astounding for people to credit. The enormity in the eyes of the more enlightened is too great for any proof to cover it, and therefore men prefer not to believe it, in spite of the candid admission of Mr. Pringle, the Secretary to the Commission. In the view of the more case-hardened, nobody is hurt by it. The pewed-in hundreds get their comforts; the pewed-out thousands lose only what they have ceased to care for, and therefore there is nobody to appeal against the wrong. Thus the evil has been exposed more than once by the Free and Open Church Association, but nothing comes of it. Appropriation has become so deeply rooted in the average English layman, that the cause of Free and Open Churches has an uphill game to play. But many who would countenance appropriation as practically useful, would feel outraged and scandalised at this persistent policy, now pursued for twenty years, of saddling our churches with pew-rents, and making a national *ex voto* a perpetual source of 'nominal' grants for the purpose. Is there any independent member of Convocation quixotic enough to get up in his place, and denounce it as a *gravamen* grosser than any with which Public Worship Acts are likely to have to deal, as one deserving a niche alongside of 'donatives,' simoniacal transfers, marketable benefices, *et hoc genus omne*? How it can be sinful to buy or sell a cure of souls, and sinless to let or hire a right of worship, it would indeed puzzle casuistry to say. And the last stronghold of the malpractice is the unblemished personal character and high official elevation of the personages who maintain it. It is an obliquity only possible in men raised above the suspicion of personal wrong-doing; and, therefore, there is all the more need that the corporate wrong-doing should be plainly spoken of. We have only to add, that not one word that we have written can be plainer than the words of the evidence actually given, to which we have referred.

ART. IX.—COMMUNISM AND CO-OPERATION.

1. *Das Kapital*. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Von KARL MARX. Erster Band. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. 8vo. pp. 830. (Hamburg, 1863.)
2. *Arbeiterprogramm*. Ueber den besondern Zusammenhang der gegenwärtigen Geschichtsperiode mit der Idee des Arbeiterstandes. Von FERDINAND LASSALLE. Pp. 36. (Braunschweig, 1874.)
3. *Zur Arbeiterfrage*. Lassalle's Rede bei der am 16. April 1863 in Leipzig abgehaltenen Arbeiterversammlung. Siebente Auflage. (Berlin, 1876.)
4. *Report and Balance Sheet of the Co-operative Wholesale Society*. (Manchester, 1878.)
5. *Co-operation: its Position, its Policy, and its Prospects*. By LLOYD JONES. (London, 1877.)

HISTORY may never repeat itself, but very similar political dangers are certainly recurrent; and it is in regard to the secret springs of social disorder that the greatest store of wisdom for the present may be gleaned from the historians and *doctrinaires* of the past. Their conception of a State was very different from ours; the city life which Plato idealised, and Aristotle sought to invigorate, would seem strangely narrow to a people that has a part in Christendom and in an age which professes an enthusiasm for humanity. We find ourselves strangely out of sympathy with their description of the aspirations, and virtues, and duties of a good citizen; but when we turn to their account of the causes of seditions, we realise at once that the evil in human nature is much the same now as it was in days gone by. We find the same verbal admissions of differences of intellectual and moral degree among men; we find the same evidence of the working of a latent tendency which would fain bring about a complete equality in social conditions. 'Those who are equal in political power come to think they should be equal in everything else.'¹ This is still the state of feeling that indicates an impending revolution, and a trivial occasion may be enough to fire the mine. We need only add that the conditions which

¹ Aristotle, *Pol.* viii. 2.

Aristotle enumerates as likely to engender the dangerous state of feeling are abundantly present in our own century.

While deprecating the forebodings of alarmists, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that our social organisation presents many features which show that it is by no means so stable as we could wish, and that its foundations are sapped by the very dangers which the first writer on political theory noticed in the democracies of old. Political power is distributed among the mass of the people, while large property and social status are enjoyed by comparatively few. May we not dread lest the struggles which raged in Greece, and which form almost the whole internal history of Rome, should be repeated in our day, and the poorer citizens should use their political power to obtain possession of the property of the rich? A State whose citizens are familiar with the extremes of poverty and wealth, while all enjoy equal shares of political power, is surely in a most unstable condition.

Not a few circumstances have tended during the last few years to increase this grave danger in our own country, by making men more keenly conscious of the inequality between their own condition and that of their more fortunate neighbours. One may merely notice that in some quarters at least the spread of education seems to have had this effect: there are numbers of poor men who believe, and who perhaps are not mistaken in thinking, that they are the intellectual equals, or even superiors, of those who are above them in station or possess far more wealth. The great publicity which newspapers give to scandals in the upper ranks of society has shaken any popular belief in the superior worth of the nobly born. These two causes have, we believe, been actively operative during the last few years. The most keen sense of the pressure of social and pecuniary inequalities exists among those clerks and artisans who are constant newspaper readers, and who are sufficiently educated to take an interest in the more popular accounts of scientific progress and advanced speculation. It is among such men that Socialism has its strongest hold abroad; and one can hardly be wrong in predicting that one effect of the new school system of this country will be to add immensely to the number of those who, while possessed of the same political power, and perhaps of as great intellectual and moral worth, as their richer neighbours, are bitterly conscious of their inferiority in the outward comforts of life. If, in addition to this, men should listen to the teaching of a secularism which asserts that there is no God to wipe away the tears from our eyes,

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV.

Q

nor any rest but that which rewards success in life, we may well fear for the use they may be tempted to make of their political power. A danger which distracted the Greek cities and destroyed the Roman republic, which startled Western Europe by the burning of Paris, which lurks secretly in Russian towns and shows itself publicly in German Parliaments, while it threatens the whole commercial system of the United States, is not one that we can afford to disregard.

I. We may, perhaps, see the precise nature of this instability more clearly if we briefly consider some social systems from which it is necessarily absent; other dangers and disadvantages there may be, but this particular one is wanting. Where there is no admission that the members of the society have equal political rights there can be no basis for the claim to enjoy equal shares of property or social status. No member of such a community regards himself as an independent unit, as one man who is in any way as good as another: each has his due place in the social group, and makes no attempt to stir from it; each, too, has his due share (*τὸ κατ' ἀναλογίαν ἑαυτοῦ*) of the goods of life, according to his recognised position.

1. There are different kinds of societies in which this is true. Such are the semi-patriarchal village communities which have had their day in almost all countries of Europe—to look no farther afield—though they are scarcely found now except among the Slavonic peoples. Curiously mingled ties of relationship, and of reverence for immemorial custom, and even of pecuniary interest, serve to hold together these communities, in which the full-grown man, even though he has a voice in the village councils, is but a part of the social unit; the movables which he uses belong not to himself, but to the family, and the land on which he labours is not private property, but common to the whole village. Under these circumstances individuality cannot assert itself; there is no opportunity for anyone to institute a comparison between his own possessions and those of others. The social group seems to possess the most perfect stability.

These Slavonic communities are also held up to us as examples of marvellous prosperity. There can, indeed, be no doubt that even under the terrible oppressions of their Turkish rulers the Bulgarians attained to a very large share of the comforts of life, while the condition of many Russian peasants would contrast favourably with that of a large proportion of our labourers. Enthusiasts maintain that this primitive system might give facilities for the employment of

machinery as well as for energetic labour on the land, and that a wonderful career of industrial success is opening up before the villages of enfranchised serfs; and the impartial¹ observer admits that the obstacles to the realisation of this dream are not nearly so great as is commonly supposed. Perhaps the truth may be that these communities might achieve great industrial success if they could survive a tendency to internal decay, of which we shall presently speak.

But, stable as these communities are, there is one sort of society still more firmly founded. In the stage of human development where village communities are possible private interests and private opinions scarcely exist: there have been men who, after having felt the force of these self-interested desires, have renounced them for ever. Such was the aim of those who retired to monasteries for 'solitude, silence, labour, and prayer.' Those who lived in the spirit of the Rule had not only forsaken the forbidden luxuries, but the controlling motives of worldly life; and even where the personal religious motive was wanting there were not a few ties to bind the little community together. *Esprit de corps*, the custom of the place, and the authority which the abbot exercised, combined to give stability to associations of men who were each willing to sink their private good in that of the body to which they belonged. Regarding these institutions from an economical point of view, they must be pronounced a great success; they were a standing demonstration of the truth that 'godliness has promise of the life that now is;' and, indeed, this very success tended to mar their religious character. We have evidence of very similar economical prosperity on the part of monastic institutions in the present day. M. Laveleye writes—

'Once grant these houses a civil personality and a right to take landed property on the same title as individuals, and the struggle between individualism and collectivity will not remain long undecided. Within a hundred years religious houses will be the temporal lords of the land in every Catholic country, and the whole soil will be in their hands.'²

2. This picture of the stability and prosperity of the social system where private interests have no place has awakened the enthusiasm of many theorists who would fain reconstruct existing societies on this firmer foundation, or at least strive at all hazards to retain the village communities which still exist. But the world cannot move backward; there is

¹ Wallace's *Russia*, i. 221.

² *Primitive Property*, p. 28.

no magic to recall the dead or dying societies to life; village communities are suited only to the earlier stages of human development, and as different nations or races have passed out of this phase of life they have found it impossible to retain their old institutions. The Russian and Bulgarian peasant begins to crave a personal independence, incompatible with the old family and village organisations, and thus the system is breaking down even where it answers best economically. In those parts of Russia where the poorer soil demands 'intensive' cultivation there is an additional incentive for those who have worked diligently on the land to endeavour to free themselves from the communal system, by which their less energetic neighbours enter into the fruits of their labours. When the mere presence in the air of Western ideas of personal independence renders the old habits of life so difficult we may doubt if these could be anywhere retained for long when population had so increased as to render 'intensive' culture necessary. Since human nature is what it is, we doubt if these dreams of the Slavophiles can be realised over any wide area. Is it necessary to add that when there are such faint hopes of retaining existing village communities it is futile to seek to re-introduce them as a cure for the evils of more advanced civilisations?

Nor can we look to the stability and success of monastic institutions for any present solution of this pressing problem. Leaving out of account the extinction of our race, which must follow the general adoption of this form of self-neglecting life, we may merely say that the motives which would induce men to undertake it are not so widely or deeply felt as to render this suggestion a practical one. The idea may be discarded at once. But we need not lay the entire stress on such probable arguments in attempting to show that the difficulty, when once it has appeared, can never be overcome on any system which involves the positive suppression of self-interest and does not allow for the due development of individual character. Analogous attempts have been made within the experience of the present generation; for any associations of men who are united by the moral principle of working for the higher good of all have far more affinity to the religious societies of old than to those French *phalanstères* with which they are frequently classed, and in which the inhabitants were never to deny themselves and only to work when and as they pleased. With a persistent courage Robert Owen sought to found industrial communities where desire for the common good should take

the place of mere individual self-interest as a motive for action; and if the failure of the experiment at New Lanark was due to external causes, those at Orbiston and at New Harmony, in the United States, showed sufficiently that his companions in the experiment had caught but little of the unselfish enthusiasm of their leader.

Indeed, these recent failures, taken in conjunction with the decay of older institutions, seem to point to some fundamental weakness, the neglect of some condition which is necessary for the maintenance and progress of human society. Nor is it far to seek. We were attracted to the study of these societies by the fact that they were *stable*, but we cannot disregard that other fact that they have for the most part been *stationary*. Whatever dreams the Slavophiles may cherish as to the future of these communities, we are not wrong in asserting that no rapid development in the arts and appliances of life has ever taken place among men who formed such social groups. Without committing ourselves to the widespread generalisation which would explain all animal development by the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, we may certainly say that the efforts of individuals to better their own condition and improve their own resources have formed no unimportant factor in the progress of the race. We cannot believe that the world would be better if we wholly exorcised the spirit of personal independence which pervades the Teutonic race, or checked the formation of individual characters; yet some such step would be necessary if we were to try to rebuild society on this discarded basis. When we come to see that the result would be undesirable, we shall no longer regret that the attempt is so impracticable. To check the free growth of personal opinion and aspiration, would be a terrible price to pay for relief from the instability that we find, between the equal voices of the many and the exceptional possessions of the few.

II. That none of the expedients by which the danger has been avoided in time past are applicable to our circumstances to-day may be a partial excuse for those who believe present evils to be so great that society can only be saved by a very drastic remedy. There are those who maintain that modern civilisation can only be saved by the practical equalisation of the condition of all the citizens of the State. Such is the aim of modern Socialists. But when one attempts to discover the means by which this would be effected the number of the conflicting proposals which are put forward for consideration renders it very hard to criticise the movement as a whole.

There are, however, certain principles which are common to all the exponents of this new gospel. We shall confine ourselves to the examination of some of these doctrines, rather than attempt to discuss fully any one of the rival systems which have branched from the common stem, still less to give a clear view of the whole growth.

Two names stand out in strong relief as those of the parents of German, which is also Russian and American, Socialism; nor would any of those wilder spirits who rebelled at different times against the personal guidance of Marx or Lassalle repudiate the principal doctrines they taught. Karl Marx has devoted his talents and industry to the writing of the book which has given scientific expression to the economical doctrines of the Socialists, and Lassalle's gifts of eloquence and powers of work were chiefly expended in organising the movement and founding associations to disseminate its principles.

1. In reading *Das Kapital*, as Marx's book is called, every reader must be struck with the power displayed in analysing the mysteries of value, and with the piquancy of the apt quotations and biting sarcasm, though one cannot help regretting that no themes are so sacred as to be screened from these mocking jibes. In the matter of the book, too, there is much which we would gladly see more generally circulated in this country, for it contains the results of most exhaustive, if not unprejudiced, researches into the past and present of English industry. Very trenchant is the scorn which is poured on the fashionable liberalism of the day and that 'genius of middle-class stupidity' Jeremy Bentham (p. 633 n.) The great assumption of such liberalism and its economy hardly needs a sneer to point more clearly the absurdity which becomes obvious when it is plainly stated.

'Their own advantage, their particular gain, their private interest, is the only force which brings men together and into relation with one another; but, as the result of a pre-established harmony, or under the auspices of an all-crafty Providence, they all bring about a mutual gain, the common weal, and the interest of the whole community.'—(p. 162.)

From the evidence which is furnished by disputes over Common Enclosure Bills and Factory Acts we see only too clearly the glaring contrariety between the effective self-interests¹ of landlords, capitalists, and labourers; and while

¹ Those who maintain that the self-interest of each class, *when rightly understood*, conduces to the common good are not justified in demanding free scope for self-interests *as they exist among us*, unless they can show that *we all know* what is for our greatest good.

various classes possess such different powers of enforcing their interests it is but mockery to tell us that the evils of society will be cured by the consistent following of the *laissez-faire* maxim, 'Each for himself and a fair field for all.' Those who believe that the citizens must be permeated with active Christian feeling in all departments of life if the State is to be really permanent, will sympathise with much of this criticism of popularly accepted principles; they will only regret that the scheme of Marx and his followers would exhibit the same evil of self-seeking in a more marked degree.

Every page adds new proofs of the great inequalities between different classes of men, and of the consequent contrariety of their interests. The Socialists contend that so long as some are so powerless to advance their own causes the field which is secured by abstention from interference on the part of the State is not fair to all alike. Here comes a further divergence from vulgar opinion; the liberalism which regards government as a necessary evil, only designed to secure the free play of individual self-development, is scornfully criticised; these passages, too, would meet with sympathy from all who believe that it is the duty of the State to promote and extend a higher life throughout the country, however much they may disapprove of the ulterior aims of Socialism.

2. Having briefly delineated the relation of Socialism to the current liberalism, we may look at its own doctrines more closely. The positive thesis which Marx develops in the published volume of his work might be thus summed up: *In the present state of society the self-seeking of individuals is productive not of the common good, but of widely diffused misery.* He traces with a masterly hand the process which has brought about the accumulation of wealth, and with it the power of promoting their private interests, in the hands of the few; the most marked steps were the spoliation of the Church, the wresting of the commons from the people, and the gradual changes which have come about from the giant industry of modern days. The last he treats with special care, and vigorously contends that, owing to the power which capitalists possess over the means of life and labour, the working classes have been practically enslaved, or reduced to mere instruments, conscious indeed, but still having their place among the other machines. There is great power in the bitter indictment which charges capitalists with having turned what might have been the means of benefiting all into an instrument for enriching themselves at the expense of

the labourers (p. 463). We cannot linger to expose the grave economical error which these statements contain ; to do so would be very tedious, because at the root of it all there is, as we must all feel, an element of truth which gives the whole indictment a semblance of justice ; and we can well understand what an overwhelming proof it must appear, to the overwrought German artisan, of the iniquity which is chargeable to capital. Further than this the treatise does not go, though there are not wanting hints that a revolution would be justified which overthrew the tyranny of a power that was born of fraud and favouritism at the time of the Reformation, and has since flourished at the expense of the poor (p. 793 *u.*) This only is worthy of remark, that the attack, though apparently directed against the self-seeking of individuals, is really pointed at the present state of society ; we might fancy that Marx imagines that there are times when individual self-seeking would result in the good of all. This is confirmed by the words of Lassalle ; he argues that since the lowest classes have no one beneath them who could suffer by their rise to power, as labourers have suffered at the hands of the middle classes, the members of the lowest classes are fully justified in pursuing their own good, since by so doing they are accomplishing the well-being of mankind at large. 'It is your happy condition that the requirements of your private interest harmonise with the pulsation of history and with the moving principle of progress.'¹ This is his blessing on those whose private interest leads them to overthrow existing institutions ; they are to give an almost free run to their passions in introducing the new society, and only to attempt to moderate them in the interests of their own class.

It is here that we notice the great neglect which is the ground of the gravest charges against these writers : they do not tell us how this spirit of self-seeking is to be exorcised from the new society. Lassalle admits that there is far too much of it among the lower classes at present ; yet he incites them to give it almost free play in a new revolution. Surely he is bound to show in what way it may be prevented from being as baneful as it is in present middle-class societies. Is he silent, not because he does not fear the danger, but because, having turned away from Christianity, he has vainly sought a saviour from social discord ?

When we come to consider the place which these enemies of *laissez-faire* would wish to see filled by the State, we

¹ *Arbeiterprogramm*, p. 31.

begin to suspect that the action of the administration would directly pander to the self-seeking of the many; it seems as if the State were not so much to work for the good of all, as to be the servant of each. Schemes which include the constant supply of credit by the State, and which would tend to make it a universal employer¹ and a universal landlord, would surely land the new-born society in ruin and misery, when the many would once more fall a prey to the few.

If a more thorough criticism of these schemes were requisite, we should only have to turn to the writings of another revolutionary leader, who, like Marx, inveighed against the tyranny of capital, but who, not content with preaching the destruction of institutions, tried to elevate men above that miserable self-seeking which would mar any other state of society as it disfigures our own. Joseph Mazzini saw most clearly the dangers which would threaten the social condition we have just indicated. If the administration were able to force each individual into his proper sphere, and extract the due portion of labour from him, there would be the most terrible tyranny the world has ever seen; if, on the other hand, men refused to submit to this yoke, there would be more license and anarchy and chaos.²

A still graver omission marks the unfavourable contrast between the German and Italian revolutionist. There can be no doubt that the latter aimed at moral progress as the result of the new society he would fain have founded on the ruins of the old; for him God and morality are the most sacred thoughts which inspire all his aspirations. But we find a very different tone in Marx and Lassalle; they pay some few verbal tributes to the value of 'culture,' but the impression which the ordinary reader would derive is that better material conditions will be given by the triumph of revolution, and that the risk is to be run for this sole end—material gain. Not the most careless reader of Mazzini could imagine him to look on improved material conditions as anything but a means towards the nobler aim of moral progress. The true disciple of Mazzini would have asked, How shall we each do most for the good of all? The reader of Marx may well rise to plan how he can get more for himself and those who are like him. In so far as Marx and Lassalle have left moral

¹ This criticism does not apply to those who invoke State management as a means of *producing* more, but only to those who expect the Government to *afford an easier life* to each. Lassalle's own position on this point is doubtful; that of many of his followers is not.

² *On the Duties of Man*, chap. xi. (Works, vol. v.)

aims in the background, in so far as their followers have ignored the small remnants of care for a higher life that remained, to precisely this extent do they offer us a human group which we cannot criticise from an ethical standpoint, because they place themselves beyond the pale, not merely of actual, but of possible civilisation. The jarring and mutual suspicion which have split up the Socialist organisations confirm only too fully the impression we had formed from considering this neglect in their doctrines.

3. The economical errors of the scheme are as glaring as the ethical defects.

‘Communism would not realise equality among the sons of labour; it would not tend to increase production, which is the great need at the present day—because it is in the nature of most men, when once the means of existence are secured to them, to rest satisfied; and the amount of the incentive remaining to increase production, diffused over all the members of society, would be so small as not to have the power of rousing and exciting men’s faculties. The *quality* of production would not be improved, as no encouragement would be offered to progress in invention, which could never be wisely furthered by an uncertain and unintelligent collective direction and organisation.’¹

Most noticeable, too, would be the change in the conception of property. We do not say that private property would cease to exist, for this would be to misinterpret the views of the leading Socialists, from Fourier to Lassalle; but we do say that private property would no longer be a stimulus to active exertion, and that the desire for it would no longer be a powerful motive in society: while these writers have failed to suggest any new factor which might serve the same purpose in the changed circumstances. The revolution which introduced the new disorder of things would give the ‘effective desire of accumulation’ a terrible shock, and the difficulties of acquiring a large share of wealth would be so enormously increased that personal gain must almost cease to be a strong incentive to labour. In this new Socialism we see the rebuilding of that very obstacle which prevented progress in patriarchal and monastic communities; and it is wholly impossible to conceive the continued existence of a mass of men who were the slaves of self-seeking, and among whom there was little place for the effective power of accumulation. A crowd of people trained to look to the State for the provision of their wants, and who were continually becoming less in-

¹ Joseph Mazzini, I. c., v. 354.

dustrious and less qualified for work, would not long continue a painful struggle for existence; yet this is the prospect which Socialism holds out. Such a State would contain, in their most potent form, the forces which have produced pauperism, and anarchy could not be long delayed.

A doctrine which accentuates the material at the expense of the moral side of life is condemned as incompatible with true human progress; a gospel which contains no thought of self-renunciation is not one that can reconcile men to each other; a society which nurtured the idle, while it gave no encouragement to industry or scope for the desire of property, would not long survive. Socialism, with its practical equalisation of the condition of the citizens and its ultra-individualism, is no more real solution of the pressing danger than the communism which ignores all personal right.¹

III. We have so far seen that the danger to our social institutions cannot be removed either by the forcible suppression of individual character or by a violent move towards the equalisation of possessions. No solution of the difficulty can be satisfactory which involves the suppression of either side of personal or social life; but perhaps a remedy may be found in a system of organising industry which claims to preserve them both. This is the aim of co-operation, a movement which traces its origin to the enthusiastic genius of Robert Owen and the steadfast purpose of Rochdale operatives, but which may claim Frederick Maurice² and Charles Kingsley as at least its godfathers. We may very briefly consider the system itself, more especially in its economical aspects, before we endeavour to estimate the probability of its removing this danger of social instability.

I. With the view of guarding against any possible misunderstanding, it may be necessary to say that we do not refer at present to the numerous competitive joint-stock associations which arrogate to themselves this name, but only

¹ The account in the *Chicago Times* of the picnic attended by 15,000 Socialists in the neighbourhood of that city on Whitsunday 1878 gives ample illustration of the correctness of the above delineation. The banner which headed the procession bore the motto, 'All for each, and each for all.' According to Mr. J. H. Belhoradsky, the third speaker, "Every man according to his needs" is the true motto of Socialism. Mr. A. B. Parsons, the first speaker, maintained, 'What they wanted was personal sovereignty, and individual rights, and so-called state; national and general good government would follow.' Nor was there mention in any of the speeches, as reported, of any other duty than that of asserting the rights of the poor, as violently as might be needful.

² *History and Objects of Co-operation*, by T. Hughes, Esq., Q.C., p. 8.

to those societies which adopt the ethical aims as well as the economical methods of co-operation. Roughly speaking, we may say that our remarks are limited to those societies which have the *moral welfare of their members in view*, and which are for the most part connected with the Central Board and send representatives to the annual Congress. The aim of such societies might be briefly described as that of *promoting the common good without prejudicing private interest*. This is not, we fear, the aim of all the members; some are only too prone to pursue their private interest through the common good, and to hold aloof from co-operation when it no longer leads to their greatest private gain; but this was the aim of the founders of the movement, and it is the aim of the societies as societies. When thus speaking of the common good we do not by any means refer to mere wealth, but to the moral and intellectual as well as material well-being of the community. Those who have seen the noble educational institute and library which are free to all members of the Rochdale Pioneers, with their 12,000 volumes and annual circulation of 37,000 volumes, will feel that the higher side of co-operative work has not been ignored, even if in some quarters it has been sadly neglected. The assistant-secretary of the Central Board has put this strongly:—

‘If the members of the co-operative body should ever generally ignore the programme of the movement, and come to regard shop-keeping as the alpha and omega of the cause, the hour of doom for the aspirations of the friends of humanity will have arrived and the knell of their hopes will have sounded.’¹

In saying that he seeks the common good, the true co-operator then interprets that phrase in no narrow sense; and the plan by which he would seek for the attainment of this object is the wise one of getting human beings to *associate voluntarily for the supply of certain needs which are common to all, while leaving each member free in all the other varieties of life*. We may surely say at once that there is no obvious objection to a scheme which does not permit a social tyranny, fetter individual development, nor allow the private needs of the vicious to override the good of the industrious, and indeed of the community. We have here association for definite ends—such ends as can be best attained by association—but perfect free play for individual self-development in all cases where the self-dependent exertions of individuals can lead

¹ *Educational Funds: their Value, and How to Use Them*, by J. Smith, p. 2.

them to the best result. And may we not ask if this is not, after all, the carrying out in the social sphere of the purpose of what Aristotle calls 'nature'—the unconscious action of the will of the world bringing all things into conformity with limit and with right reason? In all modern organisations the double need is felt—the necessity of attending to the units as well as to the ties that bind them into a whole. We have heard from military critics of the wonders done by 'educated pawns,' while they deprecated the threatened tampering with the *esprit de corps* of regiments or any slackening of the discipline of the army. Even the more trivial illustrations of an orchestra or an eleven might enforce the advantage of combining individual excellence with regard for the good of the whole, while when we think of the highest sphere of all we see how the Consciousness of the Church in our land has discarded the vain attempt of eremites and puritans to live a pious life for the private good of their own souls, as well as the vain effort of ultramontanes to suppress all individualism of character, and how it has ever sought to foster a corporate spirit by common worship and united work, while leaving free play for the development of graces of personal character.

2. However excellent the scheme may be in its idea, we could have little hope of its prospering unless it were financially sound. The constant growth of the system during the last few years, and the adoption of its economical methods by many who have no care for its higher aims, might serve as a sufficient demonstration of its success on the whole in this respect; of its occasional, and indeed not infrequent, failure we shall have to speak below. Taking the Wholesale Society's accounts, which are one of the best tests of the progress of the movement, we may say that the business multiplied between thirty and forty fold between April 1865 and April 1878. Even if a third of the so-called co-operative societies annually started fall to pieces, we have here overwhelming evidence of the success of this method of trading. It is a very simple one. Certain persons find that they have similar wants; the supplies they get from their grocers and drapers are often inferior in quality and deficient in quantity; and, as a means of protecting themselves, they agree to form an association which shall supply the articles of common consumption. Shares of 1*l.* each are subscribed by those who can afford it; a shop is rented, and the business is started. Other persons agree to enrol themselves as members, and gradually pay up their shares in sums of threepence weekly;

and on the capital thus raised the society pays a dividend of five per cent. A further proportion of the revenue may be devoted to educational purposes ; all of the nett proceeds that remain after these charges have been paid is divided every quarter among those, whether members or not, who have purchased goods at the establishment, and who with each purchase receive a ticket which shows the sum they have expended in the stores. Often the bonus to purchasers, or 'divi,' is as much as seven and a half per cent. ; and the consumer has the double advantage of getting an exceptionally large discount, and of having it saved for him till it reaches a considerable sum, instead of being returned to him in mere dribbles. No wonder that many of the members are willing to re-invest their 'divi' in the society itself, so that not a few co-operative societies are almost overburdened with the amount of capital they can command.

Hence has arisen a further application of the same principle. Many of the co-operative stores require to purchase the same articles for their customers. Why, it was asked, should they not combine to satisfy this need ? The answer was given by the formation of the Wholesale Society, to the progress of which we have referred. The next step will evidently be that of manufacturing the articles that are more commonly required, but this has not as yet been attempted with any great success.

The economical strength of the system is not merely due to insistence on cash payments, but lies in the facts, first, that the custom is so regular, since there is scarcely any possibility of overtrading or miscalculating the demand for the class of goods that is supplied ; and next, that, owing to the unparalleled facilities for saving which are offered, every increase of business is almost certainly accompanied by a simultaneous increase of capital, through the re-investment of 'divi.' It has been calculated¹ that if stores were universally used by the wage-receiving class, and if the average bonus were paid and re-invested, the capital of the country would be annually increased by 26,250,000*l.* This may give some idea of the immense possibilities which lie before these societies.

3. We may at length turn to the question which has a direct connexion with our enquiry, and try to see the bearing of this movement upon the stability of society. We have little doubt that the general adoption of the system would entirely remove the danger which threatens modern, as it

¹ Dr. Watts in the *Proceedings of the Manchester Statistical Society*, November 1872.

overturned ancient, civilisation. We do not pretend that it would introduce an era when goods should be equally divided among those who had equal voices in the rule of the State, and when there could be no grumbling among those who shared according to their numbers. Such disregard of individual differences of merit could not exist even if we could desire it. Still less do we pretend that co-operation can bring about a period of poetic justice, when the goods of each shall be great or small according to their merit. Such a state of things, excellent as it might be, is not required to ensure the stability of society. That less exalted end would be secured if there were held out to each citizen the possibility of attaining to a moderate share of the comforts of life, and of availing himself of the same methods of acquiring wealth as have built the colossal fortunes of the few. Under such circumstances none need be very poor, and all would be on the path to become richer; no social revolution could occur, and thousands who were set free from the pressure of continual care and the constant temptation to envious bitterness would be at liberty to become partakers of a higher life than that of animal comfort. For, after all, unless material well-being be the chief end of man, we need not aim at securing an ideally just division of the world's wealth, but rather at so distributing the means of life that the life of all may itself become nobler.

It may be asked whether this very meagre step towards the equalisation of fortunes would give such general satisfaction as to render our civilisation stable. A few considerations may be adduced which lead us to answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative, even though generalisations about the feeling of a class are proverbially unsafe, and predictions as to what they would feel are infinitely more so. But, after all, what discontented men desire is a more just division of wealth; and there are very few to whose sense of justice the proposal of an equal division of property would commend itself. This wild suggestion would only meet with the approval of solitary theorists if it were not that, unjust as the plan appears to common men, it appears even less unjust than the present division of the good things of life between rich and poor. Our sense of justice demands the means of decent life for those who labour hard, but our sense of justice does not demand more for all who are industrious; it does, however, require proportionate reward for special excellence. We may pity, but we find no manly indignation for the case of those whose ill-fortune has kept them at the foot of the ladder, so

long as they are on the ladder at all. Some confirmation of this reading of the dictates of the human sense of justice is found in the programme of trades unionists, who may surely be taken as representing a large section of working-class opinion. These societies do not aim, as their critics constantly assert, at establishing a barren equality between good and bad workmen,¹ but at securing a decent livelihood to all who have really acquired a proper knowledge of the trade, and for specially good workmen a differential rate, which shall start from the decent-livelihood wage as its lowest. Co-operation has done much to secure the desired decent livelihood for all its adherents, and if it were more general, half the excuse for the advocacy of communism would be removed.

While under the new system there would be no deserving poor, there would be none who suddenly became excessively rich. There would be less opportunity for the existence of middle men, and much more regularity in trade, so that there would be far less opportunity for the operations of speculators, whose wealth accrues from sudden fluctuations. A gradual alteration of the conditions of trade, so as to leave no room for this method of employing human faculties, would be no trivial boon; and in all cases where individual foresight and energy were able to reap a large reward in a world of reorganised industry men would not be slow to feel that the gain was justly acquired, for the prevailing discontent at the large gains of some capitalists arises largely from the prevailing ignorance of the risks and difficulties to which capitalists are exposed. Merchants may envy the 'luck' of a rival trader, but they do not feel it to be a sort of injustice to themselves—the magical appropriation of wealth in which they ought to share—and co-operators who were part proprietors in a large business would understand enough of the difficulty of managing such a concern to feel no irritation at the success of those who managed one with skill.

Still more: apart altogether from these questions of justice and of enlightenment, the mere existence of a widely

¹ The constant repetition of this unfounded assertion without enquiry, and when opportunities for investigation exist everywhere, is a remarkable piece of literary and platform immorality. At a conference of unionists held at Leeds in December 1871 the president, Mr. Denton (joiner), stated, in words which were re-echoed by every speaker, 'what they wanted was, that after a man had learned a trade he should not work below a certain sum; but if there were any men, in any of their societies, who were superior in skill, intelligence, speed, and general qualifications, they did not say he must go down to this rate, but that he should go up and get as much as he possibly could.'

diffused part-proprietorship in the trading concerns of the country would render a social revolution impossible. All who have the smallest fraction of a share in a co-operative store would have something to lose by a revolution ; and we believe that street fighting is generally done by men who may gain much and have nothing to lose, not by those who have something to lose but may gain more. English society is not yet so degraded that a system which satisfied the sense of justice while it gave little opportunity for discontent, and enjoyed the interested support of the mass of the inhabitants, need fear to perish.

Co-operation, then, seems to furnish a sufficient remedy for the great danger which is undermining modern civilisation ; and if this be so we can surely hardly over-estimate the importance of the duty of seeking to foster these institutions ; and if it is a duty the performance of which may well be demanded from all who love their country, it is one which may be specially sought for from the National Church, since she has unexampled facilities for performing it effectively. In every corner of the land she is seeking to foster that spirit of care for the good of others without which true co-operation can never flourish, and for want of which it has often failed. Indeed, those who are most interested in co-operative propaganda feel that the greatest hindrance to the spread of this movement is the want of a spirit of practical Christianity, which, in its daily doings, its buying and selling, looks not only on its own things but also on the things of others. If the Church can make her Master's teaching a more real power in the life of her members, she will have removed the chief obstacle to the spread of this system. But can she do more ? The answer will lead us to consider the practical working of the movement more closely.

IV. When we turn from viewing its probable results in removing a great danger from the nation, to delineate the effects of co-operation on the individual members associated, we shall see that the benefit to them is so great that the fostering of the movement may well be ranked along with the support of hospitals and schools as a work of Christian philanthropy. We need not insist on the barrenness of any Christian life which does not manifest itself in Christian work, and we believe there are few departments of pious labour in which the men of business who would fain be of active service to the cause of Christ can aid it more effectually than by assisting in the planting and organising of co-operative societies. By so doing they will be carrying on a

double work of piety—relieving poverty without pauperising, and educating their poorer neighbours in frugality, in prudence, and, one may add, in business management. Had the founders of the Clergy Co-operative Society tried to encourage a system by which stores would be started for the good of each parish, we should have hailed their scheme with delight. We will only call special attention to the fact that such philanthropic work is wholly free from the evil which attaches to so many of our charitable endeavours, an evil the consciousness of which has done so much to check the efforts of the kind-hearted. Stern economists have pointed out that pauperism is often created by ill-judged relief, and that even the best of our charitable institutions are often imposed upon by the worthless and undeserving. Those who are bitterly alive to the misery of their fellow men, and who yet ask half despairingly if there is any mode of helping them of which the direct good certainly exceeds the possible indirect evil, will find ample scope for the expenditure not of money, but of care and thought, in fostering co-operative societies, which are sure to yield beneficial results immediately and also in the long run.

1. Think of the ordinary village, and consider how immensely all the inhabitants would be benefited by the establishment of a small store. The little shop which exists in most country hamlets is a wofully expensive means of supplying the people with the necessities of life.

‘The trade is small, the capital is insufficient, and consequently there is but a small stock or variety of goods, while the shopkeeper, unable or unwilling to get his customers out of debt, is himself in debt to the trader in the neighbouring town, and obliged to accept whatever goods the latter chooses to send to him. Thus it comes about that the agricultural labourer is served with goods of inferior quality, even if they are not adulterated, at very high prices, these latter being due partly to the absence of competition, partly to the small scale on which he purchases, and partly to the long credit taken and given by the village shop. When goods in small parcels have to be brought from some neighbouring town by the village carrier, his charge for carriage will materially increase the cost, and, moreover, it is a very inconvenient mode of purchasing.’¹

To this we need only add that the wages of management form a heavy proportional charge on a small business; and

¹ From an admirable tract on *Village Co-operative Stores*, by Walter Morrison, Esq., and published by the Wholesale Co-operative Society, Balloon Street, Manchester. It gives most useful hints for the starting and management of such stores.

the worse the management is, the more the customers have to pay, as the shopkeeper will try to provide for his own livelihood at any cost to them.

The starting of a store might be a matter which would require some *finesse*; it would meet with bitter opposition from the shopkeeper if it was started without his having the management of it, and for this duty he might be wholly unfit. The cash payments would not meet with the approval of folks who had been used to a happy-go-lucky credit system all their lives; but if these initial difficulties were once overcome the material well-being of the customers would be marvellously enhanced; they would find their money go very much further, and they would have the best security that the articles they bought should be really good. Besides this, they would each have their discounts saved for them, and thus be enabled, almost unconsciously, to get a little sum together, which might either be most useful for clothes, &c., or form the nucleus of a more permanent fund for old age or bad times. Taking the bonus on custom at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, and having regard to improved quality of goods, &c., we should not be far wrong in saying that the material condition of the labourers would be quite as much improved by the establishment of such a store as it would be by an increase of 12 or 15 per cent. on wages. It is surely worth our while to make some real effort at introducing any scheme which would make the agricultural labourer two or three shillings a week better off without touching on the resources of the farmer or the guardians of the poor.

We have already hinted at the training which the store would give in punctuality of payment, and the facilities it would offer for saving; but would there be no new bond between the rich and poor in carrying on a business which was a common benefit? And the management itself, the weekly meetings of the board, the examining of the accounts, the discussion of the amount of 'divi' which could be safely paid or of the advisability of opening new branches of trade, and perhaps in time the careful investigating of the best method of investing the saved capital for which no other employment could be found—would not the mere consideration of these things, under the sense of a public responsibility, be a new and most important educational influence in the lives of the villagers who served on the board?

If we turn to a parish of a different sort, we shall see that the same system may be applied in other ways. A store might be started here too, with the same good results; but

there are many additional benefits which might be attained as soon as some capital was saved. Many artisans suffer from the discomfort of their houses, and often they find it impossible to get their landlord to put the house in order, so that they are compelled to have recourse to the costly and troublesome process of removing in order to obtain a clean and well-papered house. But it might be possible for any artisan to become the absolute owner of his house, and thus to find it worth his while to improve it himself. There are building societies, which will advance the sum necessary for the purchase of a house, to be repaid in weekly payments; by paying 1*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* in addition to his weekly rent for sixteen years a man may buy his house through such societies. He will pay altogether, in addition to his rent, during these years about half the sum the house cost to build, and he will live rent-free ever after. A man who began the attempt at the time he married might find himself the owner of house property of the value of 200*l.* at the time when he was endeavouring to apprentice his eldest son, and might be able to live rent-free ever after. Rich co-operative societies might well employ their funds thus; and surely there are parishes where the rich might supply the capital which is necessary to enable their poorer neighbours to better themselves so substantially.

The moral benefits of this application of the principle might not be less striking than the material ones. We have often seen how keenly the respectable artisan feels the contamination to which his family is exposed from contact with disreputable neighbours. It would be a priceless blessing to many mothers if they could live in a street where almost all, if not all, their neighbours were frugal, hard-working, and honest; and a parish building society might do much to secure these surroundings for all its tenants; in fact, it might do for the well-to-do artisan what Miss Octavia Hill has accomplished for so many of the very poor in Marylebone.

2. We trust we have said enough to show that the fostering of such societies may be fairly undertaken as a department of Christian work; nor do we believe that any older agency need suffer from the expenditure of the Church's energy in this new direction; there are surely those among her sons and daughters whose talents are unemployed in her service, and who might be saved from the dry rot or decay, the indifference or sentimentality, which threatens all inactive religion. And if an answer be wanted to the advancing secularism which caricatures Christianity as careless for the

bodies of those for whom Christ died, and neglectful of the good things which God created and made, that answer will be given in signs which those who run may read, if the Church in each parish shall organise some means of enabling those over whom she watches to co-operate for their common material good. Seeing such good works, men will glorify their Father in heaven.

Nor can we hide the fact from our eyes that, unless it is taken up in this spirit, the co-operative movement—with all its bright possibilities for its members and for the future stability of our civilisation—is destined to fail, to fail as utterly as other brilliant humanitarian schemes have done. There must be many moments in the history of any such enterprise when the private interest of individual members tempts them to desert the society in its time of pressure, and when only those who have an unselfish regard for the common weal remain true to the undertaking. Numbers of societies have failed through the self-regarding of their members; strong as their economical basis is, they cannot be kept together and succeed, unless those who form them are transfused with an unselfish feeling. Co-operation has been an economical success so far, and only so far, as it has been, in a wide sense of the word, Christian in the tone of its operations; and there are some of the leaders of the movement who seem to fear that the nobler tone is not so keenly felt or so deeply at work in the present generation of co-operation as it had been in days gone by. Very noble, and yet somewhat sad, are the words in which Mr. Lloyd Jones tries to inspire his fellow co-operators with more care for those higher aims which seem somehow to have been eclipsed in many minds by the prospects of a large bonus, till, perhaps, the moral side of the work may die, and nothing but joint-stock stores survive, if even they could continue. The unselfish heed for the good of others that is strong enough permanently to overcome the thought of our personal gain can only spring from the deepest source; only those who love God have thus loved their brothers also; only when organised in God's name for the good of our neighbours can the co-operative movement become the power that we hope to see it. But how shall we Churchmen answer for our supineness if we neglect this method of advancing the glory of God, of helping and ennobling His children, of saving the institutions He has blessed from the dangers which threaten our neighbours and which have destroyed prouder civilisations than ours?

SHORT NOTICES.

The Life and Times of Stein; or, Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age. By J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 3 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1878.)

THE volumes before us are the memoirs of a very remarkable man. There are ministers, and ministers; and, even in the most peaceful and prosperous times, the government of a nation is a charge which makes large demands on the prudence, energy, and patriotism of him to whom it is entrusted. But to administer the affairs of a kingdom oppressed by the greatest severity of misfortune, suffering under apparently irretrievable defeat, with a foreign force spread over the land, and the will of a foreign and merciless conqueror dictating almost every detail and controlling almost every department of the State, is a task which might well be thought one of almost insurmountable difficulty. Englishmen believe that their annals include a roll of names unsurpassed for statesmanlike ability; but yet we must admit, or, to put it in a way more flattering to our national pride, we may boast, that even in the most troublous times 'the pilots who have weathered our storms' have never been confronted with difficulties like those which we have described above, and which the subject of this memoir had to encounter.

A. F. K. Stein was the son of an imperial knight of Nassau, the nobility of whose family reached back to the very commencement of the Middle Ages; and, though he was the youngest of four brothers, by an arrangement not altogether unusual in Germany, he was selected by his parents as the 'maintainer,' or representative, of his family. He was educated at Göttingen, with the object of entering the Imperial service, through some appointment in the Law Courts. But he disliked the domestic policy of the Emperor Joseph; and as Herr Heintz, a friend of his family, was a Minister of State at Berlin, he was allowed to gratify his preference for the service of the great Frederick, and in 1780, at the age of twenty-three, he obtained a place in the Mining Department of the Prussian Government. The industry and talent which he displayed were such that his rise was rapid. After a few years he was transferred to more important offices; in 1793 he was made President of the Chamber at Cleves; three years afterwards he was placed at the head of the Westphalian Chambers, a post which was practically that of Governor of the province. And Mr. Seeley sees in the degree in which this appointment prepared him for the more arduous task of directing the government of the whole kingdom, a resemblance to the way in which his wise and honest administration of the Limousin had pointed out Turgot as the statesman best qualified to retrieve the fortunes of France.

In 1803 his attention was for a moment called off to his private affairs. He had succeeded to his patrimonial inheritance, which included absolute sovereignty over his petty lordship; but the terri-

torial changes on the German frontier which followed on the peace of Luneville, and which were of such extent that Mr. Seeley calls them the German revolution, swept away the greater part of these petty governments; and among others the Prince of Nassau incorporated Stein's lordship with his own principality. The incident is especially noticeable from the light which it throws on Stein's views of general policy. Though in the Prussian service, he never considered himself a Prussian. It is singular that of all the men who in the course of the next dozen years were most identified with the fall and the subsequent regeneration of Prussia, not one was a Prussian by birth. Stein, as we see, came from Nassau, Hardenberg and Scharnhorst from Hanover, Blücher from Mecklenburg, Gneisenau from Saxony. In Stein's eyes they were all Germans, and, as such, men to whom the welfare of Germany, not of Prussia apart from Germany, should be the first object of their exertions. To this view he gave formal expression in the following paragraph of a protest against the spoliation of his ancestral estate which he circulated through the province:—

'Germany's independence and stability would gain little from the consolidation of the few knightly possessions with the small territories surrounding them. If those great ends, so beneficial to nations, are to be attained, these small States must be united with the two great monarchies on whose existence the continuance of the German name depends; and may Providence grant me to see this happy occurrence!'
—(i. p. 125.)

His idea of the proper German policy was the absorption of all the smaller states with the two kingdoms; that of the south to be Austrian; that of the north Prussian, or even, as at one time he was scarcely reluctant to anticipate, Hanoverian.

However, his personal affairs did not long occupy his attention. In 1804 he was made a Minister of State, with the direction of the finances, which were in a state greatly needing a skilful and firm hand. He applied himself diligently to the work of reform, but soon found his efforts impeded, if not by actual war, by what to a financier is hardly less embarrassing, the prospect of war. How before the end of 1806 it broke out, and with what instant ruin Napoleon broke the power of Prussia at Jena and Auerstadt, we need not stop to relate; that such disasters should lead to ministerial complications was inevitable. The first, so far as Stein was concerned, was his own retirement from office at the beginning of 1807: perhaps as fortunate an event as any in his career. The second was the creation of an office previously unknown in Prussia, that of Prime Minister (i. 340), to which, in the spring of the same year, Baron Hardenberg was appointed. The third, that in June Napoleon compelled the dismissal of Hardenberg, by a positive refusal to negotiate with Frederick William while his confidence was given to a minister who had formerly been connected with Hanover and the Prince of Wales. The fourth was an invitation, in which the conqueror acquiesced, to Stein to succeed him, an invitation which was not only sent by the King, but (as it was generally believed that Stein's resignation in January had been accompanied by incidents mutually offensive to

both the Sovereign and the statesman) was also backed by letters from at least one member of the Royal Family, and from Blücher, the most popular of all the military commanders, imploring him not to decline a post, his acceptance of which was indispensable to the salvation of the country. Stein was ill when the summons reached him; according to his biographer, he 'had been seized with a tertian fever on hearing of the news of the Treaty of Tilsit.' But he at once signified his obedience to the royal command, and by the 1st of October was sufficiently recovered to repair to Memel, where the King was holding his court, and to enter on his new office.

No country had ever seemed in a more hopeless state than Prussia when Stein became Prime Minister. Twenty years before she had been a second-rate Power, with a military reputation that placed her on a level with those of the first class; now she was reduced to the very lowest order of monarchies, with not only that reputation gone, but her army itself almost annihilated. Whatever power she was hereafter to develop had to be created anew, for every source of strength was, or, for the time at least, seemed to be, utterly extinct. Nor did Stein shut his eyes to the greatness of the difficulties with which he undertook to grapple, though he knew further that he could not rely on the support of the King, who had more than once been, not unreasonably, offended with his harsh and dictatorial demeanour; and that he should certainly have to encounter fierce opposition from the aristocracy of the old school, among whom Mr. Seeley affirms that there was a strong French party. But he was convinced that he knew what was needed, though social reform, military reform, administrative reform, and municipal reform, in Mr. Seeley's words, 'a total reconstruction of society and government were required;' and his courage was equal to his judgment. We might almost think that he foresaw how short a time would be allowed him when we read that his 'Emancipating Edict' was issued within a week of his arrival at Memel; a law which Mr. Seeley calls 'a sort of Magna Charta to the Prussians' (i. 441), abolishing as it did the feudal exclusive privileges of the nobility; the still stranger caste-like system which divided the whole population into classes and kept them there, so that the citizen could not pass into the class of peasant, nor the peasant into that of citizen; removing the various and intricate legal prohibitions which restricted the sale and purchase of land; and extinguishing serfdom. In his municipal reform (we are not taking his measures exactly in the order in which he brought them forward) he followed what Mr. Seeley calls 'the English principle' (ii. 229) of local government. In his administrative reform he remodelled the whole system of the Government with such a keen insight into the requirements, or, it may be true to say, the capabilities of the State, that 'the Ministerial Departments created by him have been retained to the present day' (ii. 212). And, if 'he created no Parliaments, but left the King as absolute as he found him' (ii. 224), Mr. Seeley ascribes the omission to the shortness of his continuance in office, not doubting that he would have created them had he remained a minister, since 'he does not seem in any case to have admitted the

necessity of spreading great changes over a great space of time' (ii. 225). All these measures, as well as his financial arrangements, which included a gradual sale of a great portion of the Crown lands, and an income tax founded on the principles laid down by Pitt in his great speech of 1798, are most lucidly explained and elaborately extolled by Mr. Seeley; though his eulogy of the Emancipating Edict as 'Prussia's Fourth of August' (i. 462) can hardly be read without amazement. To compare that carefully-studied and comprehensive measure with the frantic proceedings of the French Assembly, when by a sudden impulse, in a single night, without premeditation, without discussion, without reserve, modification, or compensation, it abolished all the privileges of the nobles, every old feudal right or custom, the game laws, the tithes, all the peculiar privileges of every province, so that, as the Princess Elizabeth described it, 'c'était à qui ferait le plus de sacrifices,' a night which was fitly named by the Abbé de Maury 'The Night of Dupes,' does certainly seem that kind of praise which has been termed satire in disguise.

But Mr. Seeley's highest admiration is, not unreasonably, reserved for 'that military reform which was sketched and commenced, as it were, under his auspices' (ii. 96), which he regards as having 'given to Prussia a new period of military ascendancy, grander and not less interesting than the brilliant period of Frederick the Great;' though again we may be inclined to demur to his conclusion that the objects of the wars in which Prussia has been most recently engaged 'have in a manner reconciled the modern world to war, for they have exhibited it as a civilising agent and a kind of teacher of morals' (*ib.*) The principle of compulsory service was not indeed new in Prussia, but 'even in the extremity of the Seven Years' War Frederick had not thought of a *levée en masse*' (101). The details of this great reform were worked out by Stein's military coadjutor, Scharnhorst, who, as Mr. Seeley points out, in his organisation of a system intended to give 'every individual in the nation a complete military training,' had two advantages over Stein himself: one, that his more courtier-like demeanour rendered him more acceptable to the King; and the other that Frederick William himself, 'as became a Hohenzollern, was a real judge of questions of military organisation' (118).

Stein was not allowed to carry out his reforms himself. His primary object in all was not the re-establishment of Prussia so much as of Germany as a whole. He was seeking to prepare for 'a war,' which, in his own words, 'was to be waged for the liberation of Germany by Germans' (ii. 51). And in the summer of 1808 the unanimous rising of Spain and the capitulation of Baylen seemed to him so full of encouragement to Germany to do likewise, that he gave vent to his feelings in a letter (ii. 138), which fell into the hands of Napoleon. The Emperor's reply was to declare him 'an enemy of France and of the Confederation of the Rhine;' to order his arrest if he should be found 'within reach of the French troops or of their allies,' and the confiscation of all his property (ii. 316); and, as a necessary consequence, his dismissal from the Prussian Ministry.

He fled from Prussia, and took refuge at Brunn. Again 'we pass

from a Prussian to a German period of his life' (ii. 365); and when we meet him again in public life, it is, singularly enough, in the service of the Czar. He had in reality no high esteem for Alexander, whom on one occasion he described with some truth as 'a weak and sensual prince' (ii. 50). But when, in the summer of 1812, the Czar found himself threatened with the invasion of his dominions by a host surpassing in magnitude every armament of modern times, he recognised his need of an abler adviser than his existing council could supply, and in a letter expressing the 'esteem he felt for the energy of Stein's character and his extraordinary talents' (ii. 465), he invited him to Russia. Stein, seeing in an alliance with Russia the last hope for Germany, gladly accepted the invitation, reached St. Petersburg before the end of the summer, became 'one of the Czar's advisers on foreign affairs, and continued such till the fall of Napoleon' (ii. 539). It is indeed to his advice that Mr. Seeley attributes 'the steadfast adhesion of Alexander to all his German policy' (iii. 101), and his advance towards the Rhine in 1813, when the majority of his counsellors would have had him fall back on his own dominions, while the progress of events gave Stein a weight with all the lesser states of Germany, which had no small share in uniting them in the alliance by which the great common enemy was eventually overthrown. So universally felt at this time was his influence, that he was not only nicknamed 'Emperor of Germany,' but a party actually 'applied to Nicolaus Vogt, a Professor of Constitutional Law, to know whether he was legally eligible to the imperial throne of Germany, and received an answer in the affirmative' (iii. 208).

Such an elevation we may conceive to have been beyond his wishes. But he had scarcely less real power, when, at the end of the year, he was appointed President of 'the Central Administration' of all the territories occupied by the allied armies, with power to name his own council. Their rapid progress in 1814 soon brought a great part of France itself under his control, and till the end of the following year his influence was strongly felt in the arrangements which ensued on the overthrow of Napoleon. The conflicting interests of Russia and Germany, since the Russian Ministers avowed their conviction that 'the interest of Russia in the Eastern Question required her to leave France strong' (iii. 348), weakened the deference with which Alexander had originally listened to him; but 'the negotiations which took place' on the subject of the cessions to be exacted from France on the upper part of the Rhine, and especially in Alsace, 'are memorable in Prussian history; and in 1870 it appeared that Prussia had not forgotten Stein's arguments' (iii. 344-8). With the peace of 1815 his public life may be said to have ended. He returned to Prussia, where his great services were not inadequately recognised by honours, orders, and grants of land. The restoration of the estates which Napoleon had confiscated was a natural consequence of the dissolution of the tyrant's power. But while still only in middle age, the toils and anxieties through which he had passed began to tell on his constitution. In 1817 he lost the sight of one of his eyes, and though he was still occasionally consulted by the

Ministers in cases of emergency, and, on a visit which he paid to Berlin in 1827, was named 'a Member of the Council of State' (iii. 496), the nomination was rather a complimentary recognition of his past services than a demand of future assistance. In 1831 he died, after a short illness, the consequence of a cold; the inscription on his tomb recording that he had been 'Humble before God, haughty before men; an enemy of falsehood and injustice; highly gifted in duty and honour, invincibly firm in proscription and banishment; he stood erect when Germany bowed the knee, and in battle and victory was among those who freed her' (iii. 560).

Les Origines de la France Contemporaine. Par H. TAINE. *La Révolution.* Tome I. (Paris: Librairie Hachette and Co., 1878.)

IN a former number¹ we reviewed *L'Ancien Régime* by the same author, a work of which the volume before us is the commencement of the second part. *L'Ancien Régime* was a sketch of the general condition of France during the latter part of the eighteenth century: a condition full of such intolerable grievances that even the most careless or the most incompetent ministers owned some kind of reform to be indispensable. The second part, of which as yet we have but half, describes the way in which reform degenerated into, and was lost sight of in, revolution. And it is hereafter to be followed by a third part, which is to treat of *Le Régime Nouveau*, the present state of affairs, to present a correct idea of which is avowedly the object aimed at in the entire work.

M. Taine assumes the leading facts of the Revolution to be known to all who feel sufficient interest in the subject to read his book. In his earliest chapters he confines himself to a survey of the general disposition of the people, and that not in Paris alone, but also in the provinces. He shows how the universal scarcity had bred formidable riots in the South months before the meeting of the States-General, tumults little short of insurrection in Besançon, Aix, and Grenoble, and asks, not unnaturally, if such things could happen in the capitals of rural provinces, what might be expected in the metropolis itself, whose previous history proved its population to be at all times pre-eminently prone to violence and outrage, even had it not been stimulated by the evil acts of demagogues and pamphleteers, and by another circumstance which we do not remember to have seen mentioned elsewhere—the arrival of a constant stream of deserters from the army. By the middle of June, even before the fatal day of the tennis court, the whole Palais Royal had become a club (p. 41)—a club of 10,000 persons, sitting day and night, and passing with the greatest zeal those resolutions which were the most iniquitous and sanguinary. France had no more zealous, judicious, or honest patriot than D'Espresménil; but because he belonged to the privileged classes, a vote that he, his wife, his house, and his children, should be burnt, was passed with unanimity; while children traversed the alleys, bearing the heads of cats on the top of sticks. We can hardly wonder

¹ No. 5, October 1876.

that the alarm caused by such an aspect of affairs became general; though we do marvel that what had been 'a race of gallant men and cavaliers' should have yielded to the panic so unworthily as to desert their duty to their king and country, not to say to their own characters, as at once to flee from the land. There is nothing in M. Taine's book which disappoints us so much as his omission to brand as it deserves that base emigration which was one most pregnant cause of all the infamies and miseries which ensued. But he tells us without comment that in September 6,000 passports were delivered; that in October, after the horrors wrought at Versailles had shown with greater urgency than ever how, if the monarchy and the monarchs were to be saved, France had need of every hand and every arm for her and their defence, between 500 and 600 deputies resigned their seats and fled to foreign lands. 'Undoubtedly,' as he says, 'the terror was already established' (p. 138). But the greater the danger the more clear was it that it could only be escaped by confronting it, not by fleeing from it. Robespierre and Vergniaud are in truth scarcely more guilty of the murder of the sovereign than Mounier and his colleagues, who sought personal safety in an ignoble desertion of their original duties as loyal subjects, and of those which they had voluntarily undertaken as representatives of the nation.

M. Taine proceeds to show the utter incapacity of the Constitutional Assembly for the task of forming a constitution—a task 'so prodigious as to be probably beyond the power of the human mind' (p. 144), under the circumstances in which the Assembly was placed; while in the existing posture of affairs the difficulty was rendered more hopeless by the absence of all leaders of statesmanlike views, the impulsive fanaticism of the great body of the deputies, and the constant pressure under which every subject was discussed, from the disorderly violence of the spectators in the galleries. He takes no notice of the circumstance quoted by Mr. Yonge in his history of *France under the Bourbons*, from Dr. Moore's journal, that three hundred of these spectators were hired by the deputies of the Orleanist faction 'to applaud or hiss in accordance with the signs which they themselves made from the body of the hall,' at an expense of nearly 1,000 francs a day.¹

Not, however, that he condemns every one of the measures which the Assembly adopted. On the contrary, he affirms that 'by many laws, and especially those which relate to private life, by its penal code and its rural code,² by its commencement and promise of an uniform civil code, by the enunciation of some simple rules of taxation, of legal procedure, and of administration, it sowed good seed' (p. 277). But he adds also that 'in everything which relates to political institutions and social organisation it worked like an academy of Utopians, and not like a legislature of practical men.' We have no space to accompany him through all the details by which

¹ *View of the Causes and Progress of the French Revolution*. By Dr. Moore (author of *Zeluco*, and father of Lieut.-General Sir John Moore), vol. i. p. 425.

² Decrees of Sept. 5 and Sept. 28, 1791.

he supports his position ; but we may call attention to one passage, where he examines the question whether the distinction of ranks and classes as they previously existed in France was such that they admitted of salutary reform, or such that there was no alternative but their total abolition ; and lays down the principle that ' an aristocracy submitting itself to common rights, and occupying itself in a manner conformable to its aptitudes, and especially when it furnishes a high elective chamber, or an hereditary peerage, is a great good ' (p. 189), and then proceeds to institute a comparison between ' the English nobility and *gentry* and the *politicians* of the United States,' showing how, in spite of the apparent disparity of the different classes of society, the English system opens the door to talent in every rank of life, thus furnishing a succession of able men, of Pitts, and Cannings, and Peels, for the service of the State ; while, under the boasted equality of the United States, ' the favour of the people is only to be gained by those who will condescend to be hail-fellow with the rabble ; impudent charlatanerie, vulgar declamation, and servile flattery, are the only means of obtaining the suffrages of the people, and, in consequence, the better class of citizens retire into private life and seek a discreditable shelter in inactivity.'

The third and last 'book' of the present volume is mainly occupied with a powerful description of the outrages which in the miserable years 1789, 1790, 1791, spread terror and desolation over the different provinces : whose character is sufficiently designated by the term which he applies to them, borrowed from the most fearful disorders of the Middle Ages. It was the *first Jacquerie* which in the spring of 1789 covered the peaceful, flourishing Provence with the ashes of burnt chateaux and the corpses of their owners ; it was the *sixth* which in the summer of 1791 selected as the 'game to be hunted down' all the black and grey gowns. More than 40,000 priests, more than 30,000 religious women, thousands and thousands of monks, and besides them all their more devout followers—that is to say, nearly all the women of the lower and middle class, numbers of the provincial nobility, the great majority of the *bourgeoisie*, and of the peasantry—in short, almost the whole population of the southern provinces—were the victims of lawless fury, the name of *fanatic*, under which these unhappy victims were included, being as fatal as that of *aristocrat* had proved in Paris (p. 439).

We must wait for M. Taine's next volume for his judgment on the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly and the Convention, and, we may perhaps expect, on the different forms of government which paved the way for the coming despotism of the Empire.

La Duchesse d'Aiguillon, nièce du Cardinal Richelieu ; sa Vie et ses œuvres charitables (1604-1675). Par A. BONNEAU-AVENANT. 8vo. (Paris : Didier, 1879.)

THE Gallican Church, when the seventeenth century began, seemed to be sick past recovery. Let the reader turn to M. l'Abbé Houssaye's *Histoire du Cardinal de Bérulle*, and to M. Alphonse Feillet's *La Misère au temps de la Fronde*, and he will find there (we quote only

two works amongst a number which we might mention) a picture of the most lamentable character. From out of the depths, however, light soon appeared, and an attempt at reformation took place, which would have no doubt produced excellent results if the short-sighted policy of Louis XIV. had not suppressed it at the very time when it was beginning to bear its richest fruits. At any rate, the stirring times of Richelieu's administration, of the Fronde period, and of Mazarin's government, brought out in strong relief some of the noblest and most energetic individualities which France can boast of, and the late M. Cousin was perfectly right when he proclaimed the decided superiority of that time over the dull uniformity and artificial brilliancy of the Versailles Court during Madame de Maintenon's reign. Jacqueline Pascal, Madame de Gondi, Made-moiselle Legras, the *mères* Angélique and Agnès Arnauld, are persons whose names will immediately suggest themselves to all readers acquainted with the history of the French seventeenth century, and the deep penitence of ladies such as Madame de La Vallière and the Duchess de Longueville makes us nearly forget the scandal they had given to society. M. Bonneau-Avenant, already favourably known by an interesting biography of Madame de Miramion, now enables us to study the exemplary career and Christian devotedness of another lady whom, we must own, we had never suspected of claiming a place in this gallery of worthies—we mean the niece of Cardinal Richelieu, Marie de Wignerod de Pontcourlay, who married afterwards the Marquis de Combalet, and became a peeress in her own right as Duchess d'Aiguillon. Funeral orations are generally to be received only *cum grano salis*, but the perusal of M. Bonneau-Avenant's volume has convinced us that Fléchier did not overstate the truth when he enumerated the services rendered to the Church and to society by this illustrious lady.

Our space will not allow us to go into details, but we may say that the political history of France divides with the history of the Gallican Church the interest of M. Bonneau-Avenant's narrative. The murder of Concini, the *journée des Dupes*, the conspiracy of Cinq-Mars and De Thou, the arrest of Condé, are described; and whilst we are introduced to the Port-Royalists, to Cardinal de Bérulle, and to the Abbé de Saint-Cyran, mention is likewise made of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, the festivities of the Palais-Cardinal, and the literary events of the day. For we must not forget (and this is the peculiar feature in the life of Madame d'Aiguillon) that Richelieu's niece lived to the very last in the midst of the world; on two separate occasions she attempted to seek the seclusion of the cloister, but she was obliged to yield to the iron will of her uncle, who could not bear her absence, and when she endeavoured to carry out her wish of becoming a Carmelite nun, the Pope, at Richelieu's express request, plainly prevented her from doing so by a bull, the original of which is preserved amongst the treasures of the Paris National Library. Hers was, then, a life showing that all the graces of the Christian character can shine equally well in society and in the cloister, and she had the immense advantage of Richelieu's powerful

support in carrying out her religious and charitable designs. More than anyone else she helped Saint Vincent de Paul in all his enterprises. 'She was,' as the historian remarks, 'the soul of his assemblies of charity, his evangelical missions, and most of his philanthropic institutions. Her discriminating and far-sighted zeal was not satisfied with immediate results; it provided for the future, and endeavoured to found such good works as would be permanent.' Thus she founded schools and hospitals, established a kind of Pastoral Aid Society for the evangelisation of rural districts, and took the most active part in the attempts made by Saint Vincent de Paul to check the progress of mendicancy in the metropolis. The Salpêtrière hospital instituted with that view was her work; she maintained, at her own expense, the French consulates of Algiers and Tunis, for the purpose of securing to the missionaries the protection of the Government; she sent to Quebec sisters of charity whose Christian energy was of the greatest service in that colony organised by Richelieu himself; finally, the wretched galley-slaves condemned to hard labour in the port of Marseilles received substantial tokens of her genuine large-heartedness.

This very brief and necessarily incomplete sketch of the Duchess d'Aiguillon's career will, we hope, lead our readers to turn to M. Bonneau-Avenant's volume; it is a monograph which is worth a careful and diligent perusal. A beautiful portrait and an appendix of illustrative documents add much to its value.

L'Idée moderne du Droit en Allemagne, en Angleterre et en France.
Par ALFRED FOUILLÉE. 8vo. (Paris and London: L. Hachette and Co., 1878.)

THOSE among our readers who are acquainted with the tendency of contemporary French philosophy will scarcely be astonished at hearing that M. Fouillée has contrived to write on ethics a volume of 364 pages, in which the notion of God *brille par son absence*. 'The old spiritualist theories,' we are told in the preface, 'are no longer admissible,' and the principles of right and wrong must henceforward have as their substratum the will of mankind. The Germans of the ultra-Hegelian school had already declared that God exists only in humanity, and that humanity has no other life but the present one. M. Fouillée does not indeed re-echo the axiom put forth by Feuerbach, but the throwing overboard of the old spiritualist theories amounts, we think, to pretty nearly the same thing. The complete and inevitable failure of M. Victor Cousin's system of philosophy is not calculated to make us adopt eclecticism as a substitute for Christianity; yet M. Fouillée professes to borrow from France, Germany, and England, the constituent parts of his ethical programme, and his book has accordingly in the first place the interest belonging to a critical exposition. The theoretical side of the question comes next; and it is only after we have taken a complete survey of ethical philosophy, as it is understood in the three leading nations of Europe, that we can determine what share must be ascribed to each in the work of edification which the future shall receive at our hands.

M. Fouillée begins by Germany, and endeavouring to analyse the intellectual and moral character of our trans-Rhenan neighbours, he finds that its very originality consists in the antithesis of the most refined mysticism contrasting with the most decided naturalism. This twofold tendency, completed by a ridiculous fondness for symbolism and by an attentive study of history, necessarily leads to the worship of accomplished facts, and to the principle that might is the highest—the final—manifestation of right, and not a free creation of the human will. There is no inalienable natural law, no personal liberty; law is a product of time, a chronological evolution. We are thus required to acknowledge determinism as the axiom which rules the moral as well as the physical world, and to see everywhere a piece of mechanical arrangement fatally but harmoniously working out the progress of society.

If we come to England we find Utilitarianism proclaimed as the moving spring of ethical philosophy; here the antithesis is between selfishness and sympathy, and the aversion which thinkers such as John Stuart Mill, Messrs. Bain, Spencer, &c., have for what Frenchmen call the rights of man, natural rights and natural law, is derived no longer from the Hegelian notion of might and of history, but from that of individualism. If self-interest is the fundamental principle of right, it follows as a matter of course that freedom, in the most comprehensive meaning of the word, must be carried out and applied throughout all the relations of society. Reconciliation of the antagonistic axioms is to be found in the maxim, 'Do unto others as thou wouldst others should do unto thee;' and in the reducing of such a principle into practice there is no need for any governmental action whatever.

Whether we consider England or Germany, we find that in these two countries the idea of law is essentially empirical: force in the one case, interest in the other. 'France,' says M. Fouillée, 'has had the ambition of revolutionising civil and political society by taking as a substratum pure abstract justice.' Joseph de Maistre himself, the great champion of the *ancien régime*, could not help conceding that the country of Montesquieu exercised over Europe a kind of magistracy due to its fondness for the discussion of legislative, social, and political problems. The spirit of enthusiasm and the spirit of rationalism represent here the two terms of the antithesis, the result being a total disregard of obstacles, a supreme contempt of intermediate stages on the love of liberty, and a willingness to sacrifice the applications so long as the principle is admitted. Stoicism, Christianity, and the school of Locke, are, according to M. Fouillée, the great factors of French contemporary philosophy; and it is here that our author's misconception of the religion of the Gospel shows itself in the most astounding manner. The late M. Michelet, in the preface to one of his volumes, represented Christianity as too *aristocratic* to be ever compatible with the notion of right such as the French revolutionists understand it. M. Fouillée endorses this opinion, and we are very much afraid that many of his pupils at the Paris Ecole Normale will follow suit.

We have already said that the book we are noticing here is intended to be a conciliation of the three systems just alluded to, a harmonising of the three points of view adopted respectively in Germany, in England, and in France. How the blending together of the most dissimilar elements can be brought about is more than we can imagine; we wonder especially how M. Fouillée can be blind to the fact that his fellow-countrymen repudiate even the ideal, however unsatisfactory, of the men of '89, and agree in maintaining the futility of seeking a substratum for morality, because, man being a mere irresponsible machine, there can be no morality at all.

The Household Book of Lord William Howard, of Naworth Castle.
 Edited by the Rev. GEORGE ORNSBY. (Surtees Society, 1878.)

WHEN the history of the people of England is written we shall be able to estimate the value of the volumes printed by the Surtees and its kindred literary societies, Chetham or Camden. At present they are, we fear, at best appreciated only by few, and most of the volumes printed by these societies attract so little general interest that, except in a few cases, they would, we imagine, hardly repay the cost of publication. The value, however, of these books is often in an inverse ratio to their popularity. Such volumes as the one named at the head of this notice contain the raw materials, if we may use such an expression, to which historians are indebted for illustrations of the state and condition of a country such as chroniclers and memoir-writers scarcely ever furnish. In the *Household Book of Lord William Howard*, the 'Belted Will of Border Minstrelsy,' or at least 'of the Border Minstrel,' we have a view, tolerably complete, of the estate, occupation, and mode of daily life of a great Border chieftain at a time when feudal laws and feudal rights had hardly died out of the memory of men. He is not the only member of the same family who has enabled us to get a glimpse of the life of our large landed proprietors in the days gone by. The *Household Book of Sir John Howard*, which the late Mr. Hudson Turner edited for the Roxburghe Society, was a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the domestic manners of the closing days of the Plantagenets. The present volume is only less interesting because it is of somewhat later date. It enables us, however, to compare the modes of living in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, and to note the advance in refinement, if not in civilisation, which had taken place in that interval. If we are tempted to travel further back, and if we place this volume side by side with the *Household Roll of Bishop Swinfield*, so ably edited by the late Mr. Webb for the Camden Society, and with the *Wardrobe Accounts* of Edward I., we shall perhaps come to the conclusion that the England of Elizabeth and of James was still somewhat in arrear of the England of Edward I., and that it had not yet recovered from the ruin and depopulation of the French and Scottish wars. In fact, this country was in 1607 far behind, in constitutional freedom and material progress, the England of 1307. In some respects it yet lags behind the days when Edward I. sat on the throne.

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV.

S

The volume just edited by Mr. Ornsby and issued by the Surtees Society is a contribution to the history of a period of which we have too few documents—at least too few of such documents as throw light upon domestic manners. It contains the household books, the records of the daily expenses and of the daily mode of living, of a great Cumberland magnate from 1612 to 1640, the rental of lands on the northern borders of England, the amount of labourers' wages, and a glimpse of the way of living of labourers and servants just after the Middle Ages had closed and the period embraced by modern history was commencing. Much of the information which this volume contains will be new to most readers. We imagine even well-informed readers will learn with surprise that in the days when the great Tudor Queen was drawing near her death hops were grown in Cumberland, and that wine of the muscadel grape was made and, what is more, was still drunk in England. They will be able to judge of the condition of agricultural labourers then and now when they read that a ploughman might buy a quarter of wheat with a month's wages, which, we suppose, is pretty much what a Cumberland or Buckinghamshire ploughman may do now. Mr. Ornsby has made this volume both interesting and instructive by drawing out these facts, and by the illustrative notes which he has added to the text. His residence in the North has given him facilities for this, though in one or two instances this is counterbalanced by conclusions which a more southern residence might have led him to modify. Thus, relying on the authority of Stow, he has fallen into the error of supposing that hops were introduced into England 'between the tenth and fifteenth of Henry VIII.' This is untenable, though we know there is venerable authority for the statement. What economist does not treasure up the rhyme—

'Turkies, carp, hoppes, pickerell, and beer
Came into England all in one year'?

Or, if theologically-minded, has he not noted that

'Hops, Reformation, bays, and beer
Came into England all in one year'?

This, however, poetry and Stow notwithstanding, must be given up. We meet with hops, and hop grounds, and hop gardens, in Kent, and Sussex, and Suffolk, and might find traces of the same probably in other counties, at least as far back as the days of Henry VI. They are noted in the *Northumberland Household Book* as early as 1512, and in the Town Books of New Romney Mr. Ornsby will find an entry, under A.D. 1500, of rent received for land 'in the hoppegardyn.' (*Fifth Report of the Historical Commission*, p. 549.) We believe that they were known, at least in gardens, as early as the reign of Edward I., though they were probably forgotten or neglected in the time of confusion which followed upon his death, and when reintroduced were supposed to have been hitherto unknown in England. At p. 137 'pearsmain' occasions the editor some perplexity, and in a note he says, 'Possibly *perry* may be meant.' We

imagine there can be little doubt of this. In Bloomfield's *History of Norfolk* we are told that in 1205 Robert de Evermine held the lands in Norfolk by petty serjeantry—the paying of 200 pearmaines and four hogsheds of wine made of pearmaines (that is, perry) into the Exchequer.

Such a volume as this, with its numerous entries of forgotten or half-forgotten items of food or articles of dress, sends us to our notes, and adds, let us say with gratitude to Mr. Ormsby, largely to them. We must, however, not linger over its pages. We cannot, however, close this brief notice of the *Household Book of Lord William Howard* without calling attention to the appendix, in which the editor has collected some letters of and others to Lord William. Some of these were written by the Vicar of Newcastle-on-Tyne, who was apparently a strong Puritan, and they illustrate the minuteness with which Roman Catholics were watched, and their proceedings reported to head-quarters, in those days. Lord William Howard, however, belonged to that important section of the Roman Catholics whose loyalty to the Crown of England was not shaken by their religious creed. Others of these letters and papers have another value; they enable us to judge of the intellectual attainments of the squirearchy of England at a time when the landed gentry enrolled in its ranks such men as John Selden, Sir Robert Cotton, Sir Henry Spelman, Sir Simon d'Ewes, Sir Roger Twysden. Among these men, who loved and pursued learning for its own sake, Lord William Howard held no mean position. That position is all the more assured to him by the industry which has collected and the learning which has illustrated this volume.

A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, derived entirely from the Monuments. By HENRY BRUGSCH BEY. Translated from the German by the late HENRY DANBY SEYMOUR, F.R.G.S. Completed and edited by PHILIP SMITH, B.A. In Two Volumes, with coloured plates and maps. (London: John Murray, 1879.)

THE larger part of what has been, up to the present century, received as Egyptian history is mere romance. The narratives of Manetho and Herodotus are full of myths; and even after the true sources of early Egyptian history were pointed out in its monumental inscriptions, there was much difficulty in deciphering the hieroglyphic signs, and more than one highly imaginative version of events was put forth as the true sense of the records.

Dr. Brugsch has probably devoted more time and labour to the study of these inscriptions than any other living man. More than twenty years ago, in 1857, he published his *Geschichte Ägyptens unter den Pharaonen*—now out of print, and superseded by another and more complete work, an English version of which is given in these really superb volumes. Too much praise cannot be given to the editor and translator, Mr. Philip Smith, for the grace and correctness of his rendering; and the illustrations are characteristic and well executed.

The highly interesting, if somewhat monotonous, sketch of the

early dynasties given by Dr. Brugsch is far too long for us even to attempt to summarise in a mere notice. The number and duration of these is a matter of scientific interest chiefly. The great value to us, however, of Egyptian history lies in its bearing upon the Mosaic records, and the new evidence adduced in the work before us, with regard to these, is of the greatest importance. First as to the career of Joseph. While no direct mention of him by name or title has been as yet discovered, a reference to his times is apparently intended in an inscription in the tomb of a man named Baba, or Baba Abana, discovered at El Kab by Brugsch Bey, and, he says, 'hitherto unknown.' The name *Baba* was a family name, or we might almost call it a *surname*, and was borne by a number of persons in successive generations, from the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasty, and in an inscription in one of their family tombs the following occurs:—

'I collected the harvest, a friend of the harvest god. I was watchful at the time of sowing. And now, when a famine arose, lasting many years, I issued out corn to the city at each famine.'—(i. 263.)

It may be a question whether this statement is merely general or refers to a particular historical fact—*i.e.* a famine lasting for several years. But our author observes that famines following one another in so fruitful a land as Egypt, owing to a deficiency of overflow in the Nile, are of the greatest rarity, and that history knows only this one instance of one happening seven years in succession, until the eleventh century of the Christian era, when a similar series of droughts took place under the Fatimite Caliph Mostanser. It is, therefore, at least probable that the text refers to the famine under Joseph's viceroyalty. But if so, then this Baba was a contemporary of Joseph; and, as the date of the inscription can be approximately fixed to the later part of the seventeenth dynasty—the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings—we obtain something like a fixed chronological point, from which others, earlier and later, may, at all events tentatively, be deduced. Dr. Brugsch strengthens his position further by observing that all the details given in the story in Genesis are perfectly correct, and in complete accordance with the manners and customs of the period. Joseph's Hyksos-Pharaoh reigned in Auaris, or the Biblical Zoan. The distinction bestowed upon Joseph was Abrek—*i.e.* 'Bow the knee'—a term still retained among the hieroglyphics. The new name bestowed upon Joseph (Gen. xli. 45)—Zaphnathpaaneah—is, Dr. Brugsch explains, a title of high dignity, 'Governor of the Sethroitic Nome.' The name of his wife, Asnat (Asenath), is pure Egyptian of the old or middle empire. Joseph was an 'Adon of the whole land' or prince, a title only once found in the hieroglyphics. And in the recently deciphered Orbiney papyrus in Turin, we have a story of *The Two Brothers*, exactly resembling that of the temptation of Joseph by the wife of Potiphar (Putiper='the Gift of the Risen One').

Passing over the question of the period of Moses and the date of the Exodus, we notice the singular fact that no mention of the Israelites has been met with. But, after all, they were confined to

the single province of Goshen, in the north-east of Egypt,¹ and were little mixed up with the mass of the population. Why *should* they have been mentioned? They came comparatively little *within the purview* of the inscriptions.

Specially noticeable is the reaffirmation by Dr. Brugsch of his peculiar views as to the *route by which* the Exodus took place, and particularly whether or no it was by the head of the Red Sea or by the extensive Serbonian Lake (Hebrew *Yam Souph*, Sea of Reeds or Seaweed), some distance farther north than the Red Sea. Dr. Brugsch's views upon this point were stated in a paper read before the Congress of Orientalists, which met in London in 1874. This he here reprints as an appendix, and it unquestionably is an extremely formidable argument for his conclusion. The first four stations of the exodus were Rameses, Succoth, Etham, and Migdol. These he identifies with Ramses, 'the barrier' of Sukot, Khetam, and Migdol. These two are, like the Biblical places named, at a day's march distant from one another. We learn also from a papyrus in the British Museum, not only that there was a road connecting these two places, but that it was one of the two roads from Egypt to Palestine, and the author finds considerable analogy between the course taken by the Israelites and that taken by certain fugitives referred to in this letter.

'A simple letter written, more than thirty centuries before our time, by the hand of an Egyptian scribe, to report his journey from the royal palace at Ramses, which was occasioned by the flight of two domestics. "Thus," he says, "I set out from the hall of the Royal Palace on the 9th day of the 3rd month of summer towards evening, in pursuit of the two domestics. Then I arrived at the barrier of Sukot on the 10th day of the same month. I was informed that they [that is, the two fugitives] had decided to go by the southern route. On the 12th day I arrived at Khetam. There I received news that the grooms who came from the country [the lagoons of Suf, said] that the fugitives had got beyond the region of the Wall to the north of the Migdol of King Seti Meneptah."

'If you will substitute, in this precious letter, for the mention of the two domestics the name of Moses and the Hebrews, and put in the place of the scribe who pursued the two fugitives the Pharaoh in person following the traces of the children of Israel, you will have the exact description of the march of the Hebrews related in Egyptian terms.'—(ii. 359.)

This course would bring them to a point where they would be 'entangled' between the sea, the desert, and the bog (Exod. xiv. 2), before Pihahiroth (*Pihakhiroth* = Entrance to the Gulfs). These great swampy flats extend between the Mediterranean and the Lake Serbonis; and after the Israelites had crossed these in safety 'a great wave took by surprise the Egyptian cavalry and the captains of the war chariots who pursued the Hebrews. Hampered in their movements by their frightened horses and their disordered chariots, these captains and cavaliers suffered what in the course of history

¹ The large and excellent map of the *nomes* furnished by Dr. Brugsch does not identify Goshen, nor, as far as we have been able to discover, does it mention this province at all. We may add here that the English words on this map (a Leipsic one) are by no means always unimpeachable in spelling.

has occasionally befallen not only simple travellers, but whole armies.'

Such is the theory, which is at least highly ingenious; perhaps even *vraisemblable*. And here we must take leave of this highly interesting and most important work; only remarking how uniformly the tendency of this, as of all modern researches, is to enhance the credit of the Mosaic records as truthful historical documents, contemporary, or nearly so, with the period with which they deal. A more effectual disproof of the wild theories of certain modern critics as to the untruthful nature and late origin of the Pentateuch could hardly be imagined.

The Student's Commentary on the Holy Bible. Founded on the *Speaker's Commentary*. Abridged and edited by J. M. FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bexley, Kent. In six volumes. Vol. I. (London: John Murray, 1879.)

It is not surprising that it should have occurred to those interested in the *Speaker's Commentary* that its voluminous matter might be made use of for the benefit of another and a more numerous class of readers. This has accordingly been done by the competent hands of Mr. J. M. Fuller, and with much care and skill. The critical discussions have for the most part been omitted, and also the dissertations upon special points. That on 'Shiloh' (Gen. xlix. 10) has been replaced by a note, and also that on the 'Dead Sea' (xix. 25) left out. On the other hand, the notes have sometimes suffered by this compression, and those, *e.g.*, on the 'Sacrifice of Isaac' (Gen. xxii. 2-14) and on 'Jacob and Esau' (chap. xxvii.-xxviii.), are distinctly not equal in exegetic completeness and force to the original notes from which they are condensed. Probably that is to a certain extent unavoidable; but the *Student's Commentary* retains most of the spiritual and homiletic expositions of the former work (though we are sorry to see the excellent and pregnant note on Exodus xx. 13, 14, which is wholly of this kind, cut down to a line and a half), and it will, from its comparative brevity and cheapness, be of value to less advanced or less opulent students of the Holy Scripture.

The Prophet Isaiah; Theologically and Homiletically Expounded. By CARL WILHELM EDUARD NÄGELSACH, Pastor in Bayreuth. Translated from the German, with additions, by the Rev. SAMUEL J. LOWRIE, D.D., and Rev. DUNLOP MOORE, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

THIS volume is a very fine specimen of the characteristic method of this essentially German commentary—*i.e.* excessive elaboration, lengthy and prolix discussion of the subject in every point of view, and painstaking citation of the opinions of all previous writers, or what German authors call the *Literatur* of the subject. It should be

added that, as a consequence of this (sometimes tiresome) length, the preface and prolegomena exhibit a complete view of the critical controversy, which may be read up with great profit from it. The conclusions come to appear to be substantially orthodox, though the commentator seems sometimes puzzled to find a *tertium* between orthodoxy and criticism, which pursue different lines of thought, and each of which he accepts. Here, for instance, with regard to prophecy in general:—

‘Let no one (as, *e.g.*, Knobel does) make out of the prophecy a marvellous masked representation of events that had already taken place. I willingly confess that the representations of the Divine origin of prophecy have been faulty in many respects. It has often been overlooked that not everything can be prophesied at any time; that, therefore, each prophecy must have its historical reason and ground, and that the forms and contents of the prophecy must be in harmony with these. It has been further overlooked that prophesying is a seeing from a distance. From a distance one may very well observe a city, mountain, and the like in general outlines; but particulars one does not see. For this reason genuine prophecy in general will never meddle with special predictions. Where, however, the latter takes place, either the special trait contemplated is no subordinate individual thing, or it justifies the suspicion that it is false. These and like mistakes have been committed. But this does not hinder me from maintaining the Divine origin of prophecy in general, and also from claiming a scientific title for my construction of Isaiah’s prophecy.’—(p. 6.)

In a commentary on Isaiah the crucial question is, of course, as to the author of chapters xl.-lxvi. Here Dr. Nägelsbach is clear and unflinching in upholding the unity of the book. He says clearly, ‘The great mass of chapters xl.-lxvi. are so unmistakably genuine prophecy—in fact, the crown of all Old Testament prophecy—that we can ascribe them to no other than to the king amongst the prophets, to Isaiah.’ But he neutralises very much the force of this declaration by allowing frequent interpolations and alterations by some later hand. ‘It may be,’ he says, ‘that we possess the last chapters only in a form more or less wrought over.’ Thus he asserts that lxvi. 3-6 (3, 4?) ‘is manifestly an interpolation, interrupting the connection and occasioned by a misunderstanding of what precedes.’ In his general arrangement of the contents of the book he revives and modifies the idea of Ruckert that *three* is in it a fundamental number. He makes the introduction to be threefold, and the body of the prophecy to consist of three enneads, or sections, of nine chapters each. The last of these (lviii.-lxvi.) he regards as not only left incomplete in number, but as not having received the last touches of the author, and having been ‘prepared for the press,’ as we should say in modern times, by some other hand. It is an arbitrary expedient to meet a confessed difficulty, but which adverse critics are apt to exaggerate; and we do not know that much can be said for or against it. It is tolerably successful in accounting for the facts, and so far is probable.

A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. By various Writers. Edited by CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vols. I. and II. (London : Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.)

BISHOP ELLICOTT'S *Commentary* claims consideration on the score of newness in design and construction, and especially as 'setting forth the inner life of Scripture, not without reference to the hopes, fears, needs, aspirations, and distinctive characteristics of the restless age in which we are living.' The devotional element which finds so conspicuous a place in the *Commentary* before us was deliberately excluded from the more scholarly and masterly work known as the *Speaker's Commentary*, as that work aimed chiefly at setting forth a scientific exposition of Holy Writ and a solution of critical difficulties. What was made the supreme and dominant purpose of the *Speaker's Commentary* is here not by any means ignored, but made subordinate and subservient to the spiritual lessons of Holy Scripture. This, the main feature of Bishop's Ellicott's *Commentary*, is so far from being 'new in its design,' that it is really a very old feature in English commentaries, as in the commentaries of Matthew Henry, Scott, Girdlestone, D'Oyly, and Trench, and many others. But what is really new in this *Commentary* is that it combines new elements and meets new needs. Its spiritual instruction and application is more reverent and quite as practical as that of the best of its predecessors, while it includes, moreover, very much that they exclude. It corrects the most glaring mistranslations of the Authorised Version; it utilises and applies the best and most valuable results of the highest modern Biblical criticism; it solves difficulties in the text and allusions clearly and candidly; historical illustrations and supposed discrepancies are fairly and fully discussed, while the narrowness of view which disfigures some well-known English commentaries on the New Testament has no place in these pages. The Introduction deals critically, but in a popular style, with the books of the New Testament, the Greek text, the English version, the origin of the first three Gospels, and the harmony of the Gospels. This Introduction, and the annotations on S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, are from Professor Plumptre, and bear all the well-known marks of his mind and reading. The Gospel of S. John is annotated by Professor Watkins, and the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians by Dr. Sanday; and to the Rev. T. T. Shore has been assigned the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Each of these commentators has prefaced his special portion by a special introduction, dealing with the scope and aim of the writer on whom he is about to comment, and passages too important to be discussed in a passing foot-note are dealt with by way of Excursus. Professor Plumptre is not always as precisely accurate and as profound and original as his coadjutors Dr. Sanday and Professor Watkins. The Rev. T. Shore is evidently something of a novice in this field of critical exegesis. Amongst the subjects of interest most usefully treated in the Excursus we may note 'The History of Our Lord's Life to the Commence-

ment of His Ministry,' 'Demoniac Possession,' 'The Meaning of Paraclete,' 'The Omission of the Raising of Lazarus from the Synoptic Gospels,' 'The Sacramental Teaching of S. John's Gospel,' 'The Doctrine of the Word,' 'The Later Years of S. Paul's Life,' 'The State of the Heathen World at the Time of S. Paul,' 'The Excursus on the Passage (Gal. iv. 25), "For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia."' The close of the second volume brings us to the end of the Epistle to the Galatians.

We are, however, forced to observe the marked absence of any recognition in these comments of 'the Ecclesia docens.' It would almost seem as if the annotators had made it their *aim* to keep in the background the dogmatic attitude of the Catholic Church; certainly the result is that we should think the work to be quite as acceptable to members of the Protestant sects as to Churchmen. However, it is gratifying to find that Professor Watkins, in his excursus on the Sacramental teaching of S. John's Gospel, altogether repudiates the ordinary Protestant interpretation put on the discourses of our Blessed Lord at Capernaum (vi. chap. 6), as having no reference at all to the Holy Eucharist.

'The conclusion,' argues Professor Watkins, 'that the words have no reference to the Eucharist would require the statement, not that the disciples could not understand them at the time, but that Jesus Himself did not; and no one who is prepared to admit that to Him the future was as the present, and that when He said, "I am the Bread of Life," "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," He knew that He would also take bread and break it, and say, "This is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me;" and would take the cup, and say, "This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you," can doubt that He taught in word at the one Passover that which He taught in act and word at the other. It may be granted, again, that when S. John heard, with or from Nicodemus, of the new birth which was of water and of the Spirit, he may have asked, as the teacher of Israel did, "How can these things be?" But the statement that the discourse does not apply to the sacrament of Baptism is inconsistent with the commission to the Apostles to baptise all nations; and the fact that the Day of Pentecost and the history of the Apostolic Church must have brought to the writer's mind in all its fulness what the meaning of the spiritual birth was.

Of course there are not a few critical positions from which we have to differ; and although, as a rule, the commentary before us corrects—and well corrects—the inaccuracies of the English Authorised Version, yet it unaccountably passes over Acts ii. 42, where it is doctrinally so important to give the significant and striking force of the definite article in Greek, in the words '*the* doctrine and *the* fellowship of the Apostles, and in *the* breaking of *the* bread, and in *the* prayer,' all of the highest doctrinal moment. Then, again, in Acts vii. 46, we read in the Authorised Version of David desiring 'to find a *tabernacle* for the God of Jacob.' Here our translators have given *σκήνωμα* (a temple or dwelling-place) the force of *σκηνή* (a tent or tabernacle), an error unnoticed in this commentary, notwithstanding the manifest absurdity of representing, as it does, David desiring to

find that which he already had—a 'tabernacle' for the Lord, instead of representing him as desiring to find that which he had not—a temple for the Lord. If Professor Plumptre will consult Suidas and Hesychius on the word, he will see the real meaning of *οικηρωμα*, and the consequent force of our objection. In Acts vii. 4, the well-known chronological difficulties of this passage are scarcely solved by the assertion that 'a man speaking for his life does not commonly carry with him a *memoria technica* of chronological narrative.' The real difficulty is solved if we bear simply in mind that Abraham was not, as is assumed, the eldest son of Terah (most probably he was the youngest); and if we take seventy as the age of Terah at the birth of his eldest son, and seventy-five as the age of the youngest son of Terah at the time of his father's death, and assuming, what is most probable, that Haran was sixty years older than his son-in-law, Abraham, we have found the whole number, two hundred and five, as the age of Terah.

The Holy Week and the Forty Days. By the Rev. G. F. POPHAM BLYTH, M.A. (London: Skeffingtons, 1879.)

A GOOD, careful book, giving, first of all, a sort of harmony of the sacred story from the commencement of the Holy Week to the Ascension, including the portion of it contained in the Acts; secondly, a narrative setting forth the connexion and sequence of the events recorded, with such remarks and elucidations as seem requisite; and thirdly, a series of somewhat elaborate notes on the text itself, such as any ordinary commentary would give. We have examined it with considerable minuteness, and can recommend it both for the intelligence and perception shown in the way it traces the course of the events, for the accuracy of its notes, and for the soundness of its general tone. Here and there we think that a second edition may fill up a gap. For instance, Mr. Blyth observes that in our Lord's parable of the vineyard, delivered on the Tuesday in Holy Week, He was clearly applying Isaiah v. 1-7, but he fails to *clinch* the remark by pointing out that exactly as Isaiah followed up the parable by his *six* woes (Isaiah v. 8-23), so our Lord the same day followed up *His* parable by the *eight* woes, so that no hearers could have doubted that He was applying Isaiah. So again we desiderate an exposition of the *mutual relation* which exists between the gift of the Holy Ghost in S. John xx. 22 and that of Pentecost. But the book shows great pains and care, and it is one which most clergymen may study to their own profit and all may recommend to their more educated parishioners.

Classical Revision of the Greek New Testament. By W. MILLAR NICOLSON, M.A. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.)

PROFESSOR LIGHTFOOT has already most ably gone over the main ground traversed by the author of this work, although it is evidently written from an independent point of view. The conclusions arrived at, the premisses leading to these conclusions, as well as the suggestions and corrections proposed by these two distinct writers, bear a

very striking resemblance to one another. In accuracy of scholarship and a critical insight our author is clearly far behind his distinguished predecessor. Good as many of Mr. Nicolson's remarks undoubtedly are, still he has a tendency to fancifulness in reading into the original Greek senses beyond those present to the minds of the writers. As an example of this, we may refer to Matt. ix. 34, 37, 38, where we are told that our Lord, hearing the sneers, yet rising above their reach with serene composure, gives the word ἐκβάλλει a new application in ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἰργάτας. In a curious Appendix on the 'Superscriptions on the Cross,' this writer endeavours to solve the difficulties presented by the three different superscriptions by the hypothesis that they were entrusted to three different persons, who spoke three different languages, to draw up a title in each. The Roman wrote briefly, 'Rex Judæorum,' the King of the Jews of S. Mark and S. Luke; the Greek supplying S. Matthew's version, 'Jesus, the King of the Jews;' and the Jew maliciously adding 'Jesus, the Nazarene.' This is certainly plausible, but scarcely meets all the difficulties of the case, even were it fully demonstrated. Moreover, we can scarcely accept μὴ σκύλλου, 'Do not *bother* thyself,' as an improvement on the Authorised Version, 'Do not trouble thyself.' The former rendering is vulgar and colloquial; the latter, simple and not undignified.

Miscellanies, Literary and Religious. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. In Three Volumes. (London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1879.)

If there be something to say in favour of the practice of a man of action, of letters, or of politics writing his own memoirs, there is much more to be adduced on behalf of such an one collecting and editing his own literary works, if he be the author of such, in his lifetime. The former practice is, we imagine, on the decrease. Men labour with a persistency which leaves them no leisure to write autobiographies. But it is otherwise with the correction and final issue of their works, if they should have written any; and it may seem to be a duty which a great writer owes to posterity, as he owes it to himself, to collect and arrange his ἔπεα πτερόεντα, and not, as the Cumæan sibyl,

'Nunquam deinde cavo volitantia prendere saxo,
Nec revocare situs aut jungere carmina curat.'

This is accordingly what Bishop Wordsworth has done, employing, as he says in his brief preface, for that purpose 'the comparative leisure of a summer vacation in putting them together, with the hope that, if they are of any value and are worth being preserved, they may thus perhaps acquire a permanence which in their separate form they could hardly hope to attain.' He has been a voluminous writer during the whole of his long and distinguished career, and very few of the more important crises in the history of the Church since he attained manhood are here unmarked by letter or pamphlet from his pen—'works,' says the Bishop, 'published at intervals, from time to

time, during a long period of years, which, as far as the author is concerned, are, humanly speaking, now drawing to a close.'

The collection of works here presented covers, therefore, the entire career of Bishop Wordsworth. Of course it does not include his Biblical Commentaries nor his memoirs of Bentley and Wordsworth the poet, nor that excellent treatise *Theophilus Anglicanus*, nor his grammatical works nor critical editions; and we might easily extend the list of exceptions. But we really think it comprises nearly everything else of note that the Bishop has written, from the *Notes in Greece, France, and Italy*, published, we think, in or near 1845, to his *Systatic Letter*, in Greek, to the Archbishop of Cyprus on behalf of Mr. Josiah Spencer, published a few weeks back. These are for the most part arranged in their order of publication, and in some—too few—instances connected by short explanatory paragraphs. In one of these Dr. Wordsworth notes his own accession to the episcopate. One and all they are full of interest, and we could have wished to have many more of them. In particular the documents here given, with the notes and explanations, constitute almost a history of the earlier stage of the Old Catholic movement; and it is not too much to say that the excursus entitled *The Vatican Council of 1869* is one of the most powerful arguments ever framed by any English divine against the overweening pretensions of the Church of Rome.

The volumes would repay the reviewer for a far more lengthened notice. Even the very-earliest of them, that on *Pompeian Inscriptions*, though the fuller and completer works of De Rossi and Dr. Northcote have followed in its wake, may be read with as much interest as ever; and a similar remark may be made concerning the little books of Continental travel. The volumes deserve, and we think will receive, a hearty welcome.

The Divine Epiphany; or, Ten Progressive Scenes. By the Rev. HASKETT SMITH, M.A. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THE object of these lectures on the Gospels for the Epiphany Sundays is to set forth the teaching of the Church in connexion with the various manifestations made by our Blessed Lord Himself of the nature of His divine mission, and to confirm this teaching of the Church from Holy Scripture. In this way some strong and hitherto but little noticed links are added to the chain of Scriptural evidences for the divinity of Jesus Christ; the unbroken continuity in the Epiphany services of the Christian Church is also traced with a firm hand, and many useful and edifying lessons of a practical character are given for the guidance and instruction of the members of the Church. The scenes here commented upon are:—Jesus, the Divine Infant; Jesus, the Divine Youth; Jesus, the Divine Sympathiser; Jesus, the Divine Lord of Angels; Jesus, the Divine Lord of Nature; Jesus, the Divine Controller of Satan; Jesus, the Divine Teacher; Jesus, the Divine Prophet; Jesus, the Divine Judge. By far the best portion of the work is the practical edification drawn by the

eloquent author from each of these scenes ; although on some few points we cannot altogether go along with Mr. Smith. He tells us, for example, that our Blessed Lord kept Himself 'under the direction and sway of his parents for thirty years.' We have scarcely any Scriptural warrant for this unqualified assertion ; nor have we any Scriptural warrant for the assertion that the leper '*ran with impetuous haste towards Jesus.*' We think, too, the style of the work would gain in purity and elegance by the pruning of such diction as '*wending its way,*' and '*the night has shed a pall of darkness ;*' but these are small blots on a very beautiful and useful treatise.

Sermons to Children. By the Rev. S. BARING GOULD, M.A. (London : Skeffingtons, 1879.)

THESE are not only sermons to children ; they are really sermons suited for children alike in mode of thought, simplicity of language, and lessons conveyed, and they are very beautiful. No mere critical description can do justice to the charm with which spiritual and moral lessons are made to flow (not merely are *drawn*) out of natural facts or objects. Good examples of this are to be seen in the sermons on 'Flowers' and 'Evergreens.' Stories, too, are made use of with admirable taste, as in that of the Ring in the sermon on 'Innocency.' The way in which the lesson of the virgin's lamp is worked out and applied in the first sermon of the volume, is as forcible as, to us, it is new ; and the lessons taught are, without exception, sound and admirable. We cannot doubt that the volume will be, and will remain, a standard favourite.

Spiritual Instructions: the Religious Life. By the Rev. T. T. CARTER. (London : Masters, 1879.)

FOR members of religious houses this book must be invaluable. It will also have a wider usefulness. To those outside of such houses it will explain what is the real *motif* of that life, a matter on which we have found many excellent people strangely uninformed. Thus it will serve the double purpose (1) of enabling those whose duty it is to *advise* others to do so more wisely when consulted as to whether this or that person has a real vocation to it, (2) of enabling persons who think they have a vocation to apply some preliminary test to their own case. As to the charm and beauty of the book, we need say nothing ; but we are anxious that its usefulness to Church people generally should be known.

The Sinless Sufferer. Six Sermons by the Rev. S. W. SKEFFINGTON, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. Eighth edition. (London : Skeffingtons, 1879.)

WE regret that the date of our own publication, falling when it does, has prevented our reminding our readers of this very lovely little book just before the Holy Week. That such a book should have so soon reached an *eighth* edition is a cheering fact in these days, when we are told that scepticism flourishes, as any of our readers, who may not yet know it, will feel if they will buy it.

Christian Care of the Dying and the Dead: a Few Hints on Burial Reform for Friendly Readers. By W. H. SEWELL, M.A., Vicar of Yaxley, Suffolk. A new edition, with illustrations. (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1878.)

THIS is not a new book, but it is one which is worth taking note of, as giving information on a great many points of conduct which are not without their real importance, but which occur, it may be, for the first time to a family when, by the sickness and death of one of its members, the surviving part of it has but small inclination to consider with much discrimination all the painful details which are to follow. To all is not given the mental firmness ascribed to Bishop Wilson, who is said to have provided his coffin, long before his death, 'from one of the elm trees that he planted soon after his coming to the island, which was cut down and sawed into planks for that purpose,' and when it was provided made to serve the purpose of a *memento mori*. But a certain care for the decencies of burial may be attained without singularity; and a sufficient acquaintance in detail with the sad duties of the sick chamber and the funeral bier is a matter of prudence in all; and we need hardly say that it is specially incumbent on the clergy and Church helpers to acquire such knowledge. They can have no better guide in so doing than Mr. Sewell's pious, sensible, and wonderfully complete little book. His drawings of improved designs for coffins (plate i.) and for biers will be very helpful in country parishes. We can hardly agree, however, with his recommendation of French merino (p. 80) for palls even in the poorest parishes. A shower of rain would make sad work of such a pall.

The Presence and Office of the Holy Spirit. By the Rt. Rev. A. B. WEBB, D.D., Bishop of Bloemfontein. (London: Skeffingtons, 1879.)

THERE is a remarkable conjunction of theological thoroughness and religious fervour in these Lectures which makes us wish that they may be read by others than those who heard them delivered. The subject is an important one, and its practical bearing on our whole life and duty is very vividly handled.

The Englishman's Brief on Behalf of his National Church. (London: Wells Gardner, 1879.)

ADMIRABLE both in matter and arrangement. So long as the Liberation Society's misrepresentations are scattered broadcast like snow-flakes over the country, so long the distasteful task of contradicting them at all points is not merely a duty to ourselves but to the people at large, whom we have no right to leave unprotected against the reception of falsehood. Hence the need of such books as this. Hence our duty when we meet with such a book to give it our emphatic recommendation. The history, nature, and extent of endowments, the work actually done by the Church as at present placed, the true nature of the connexion between Church and State, the evils which would result were the Church to be disendowed, and the real

position of Dissenting bodies towards the secular courts—all these and a multitude of other necessary topics are fully and truly handled, and as a book for clergymen to circulate among the middle-class laity we cannot speak too highly of it.

What is a Churchman? By the Rev. G. VENABLES, S.C.L. (London : Wells Gardner, 1879.)

WE name this booklet along with the former as being a good companion to it. The *Englishman's Brief* deals with the external status and work of the Church. Mr. Venables goes inward and shows what the Church really is, and what its members really are, or at least what they ought to be if they are true to the name of Churchman. It is plain, simple, and most true.

The Rite of Confirmation Explained. By the Rev. D. J. EYRE, M.A. (London : Skeffingtons, 1878.)

WE are constantly being asked for some simple and yet complete statement of the nature of confirmation to be put into the hands of intelligent and educated young people, and also into the hands of their parents or guardians. This is just the book for such purposes. It is very full and complete, and yet not too long—only some two-and-thirty pages—and it is quite trustworthy.

Marco Visconti. Translated from the Italian by A. D. (London : Charing Cross Publishing Company.)

WE hope that *Marco Visconti* will never cease to be a favourite among us, both for its own sake, because of its exceeding grace and beauty, and also for the good of our own people, who cannot really admire and love such a story and yet yield to the corruption of taste (to say no worse) to which so much modern novel-writing tends. We are, therefore, thoroughly grateful for this good and readable translation, of which it is only fair to say that, while strictly accurate, it cannot be said to sacrifice the spirit of the original to the mere letter of correct rendering. It is beautifully got up, and will be a favourite for presents. The poetry is extremely well rendered.

Goldsmith. By WILLIAM BLACK. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1879.)

MR. BLACK has won golden opinions as a novelist, but we fear from the volume before us that he is not likely to win the same reputation as a biographical critic. As these pages show, the writer has not only no sympathy with the sorrows and struggles of poor Goldsmith, but has the bad taste to sneer at those who, like Mr. Forster, have felt deep commiseration for Goldsmith's hard lot in life, and his constant struggle to keep his head above water. It would be some set-off against this if he had given us something better than a meagre and second-hand criticism of the powers of Goldsmith as a poet, a novelist, and a dramatist. The picture here given of Goldsmith, as 'the most unfortunate of poor devils,' is not creditable either to the

taste or talent of the writer, and we are sorry to have to speak thus of a work which appears in a series generally so well executed as that of the 'English Men of Letters.'

Helps to Worship : a Manual for Holy Communion and Daily Prayer.

Compiled by the Rev. CHARLES BOYD, M.A., Rector of Prince's Risborough, and the Rev. H. G. MEARA, M.A., Curate of Newbury. (London and Oxford : A. R. Mowbray and Co.)

Is a manual compiled with great care, and likely to prove exceedingly useful in parishes. The forms for daily prayer are simple and well selected, and the preparations and devotions for Holy Communion are such as could readily be used by the poor.